

John 6,51c-58: Eucharist or Christology? *

John 6,51c-58⁽¹⁾, the final part of the discourse on the bread of life (John 6,22-59), faces the exegete with various problems⁽²⁾. Interpreters often consider the passage to be about the sacrament of the Eucharist⁽³⁾: in their view, Jesus' flesh to be eaten and his blood to

* Revised version of a paper presented to the Seminar on the Johanneine Writings at the SNTS Meeting in Madrid, July 1992.

(¹) I take as John 6,51c the words: "and the bread which I shall give is my flesh for the life of the world".

(²) A useful survey of the history of the exegesis of John 6,22-59 in our century can be found in M. ROBERGE, "Le discours sur le pain de vie, Jean 6,22-59. Problèmes d'interprétation", *LavalTP* 38 (1982) 265-299. For the period until 1900, see C. H. LINDIJER, *De sacramenten in het vierde evangelie* (Verhandelingen Teylers Godgeleerd Genootschap NS 29; Haarlem 1964) 9-37. See also C. R. KOESTER, "John Six and the Lord's Supper", *LQ* 4 (1990) 419-437, esp. 420-426. At the Council of Trent, there was a strong controversy about the two interpretations (christological or eucharistic) of John 6; the Council finally intentionally left the question open, see F. CAVALLERA, "L'interprétation du chapitre VI de saint Jean. Une controverse exégétique au Concile de Trente", *RHE* 10 (1909) 687-709.

(³) So the scholars listed by ROBERGE, "Discours", 275-298, and more recently: J. BECKER, *Das Evangelium des Johannes I* (ÖTKNT 4/1; Gütersloh - Würzburg 1979) 199, 219-221; K. MATSUNAGA, "Is John's Gospel Anti-Sacramental? — A New Solution in the Light of the Evangelist's Milieu", *NTS* 27 (1980-81) 516-524; M. GOURGUES, "Section christologique et section eucharistique en Jean VI. Une proposition", *RB* 88 (1981) 515-531, who restricts the eucharistic part to vv. 51c-56 (+ v. 27); S. LÉGASSE, "Le pain de la vie", *BLE* 83 (1982) 243-261, esp. 251-261; J. D. CROSSAN, "It is Written: A Structuralist Analysis of John 6", *Semeia* 26 (1983) 3-21, esp. 15-16, who considers vv. 49-58 as eucharistic; J. GNILKA, *Johannesevangelium* (Die neue Echter Bibel; Würzburg 1983) 53-54; U. C. VON WAHLDE, "Wiederaufnahme as a Marker of Redaction in Jn 6,51-58", *Bib* 64 (1983) 542-549 (vv. 51-58 are the eucharistic passage); S. DOCKX, "Jean 6,51b-58", id., *Chronologies néotestamentaires et Vie de l'Église primitive. Recherches exégétiques* (Leuven 1984) 267-270; S. A. PANIMOLLE, "Fede e sacramento nel discorso di Cafarnao (Gv 6,26-58)", *Fede e sacra-*

be drunk indicate, at least primarily, the elements to be consumed by the participant in the Eucharist. "Bread" is here supposed to be a eucharistic term: it denotes the bread used in the sacramental celebration and identified with Jesus. Who eats this bread, has eternal life (cf. vv. 53-54.58). When the closing passage of the discourse is read in this way, it seems to differ from what precedes. In the part of the discourse up to and including v. 51b, the identification of Jesus with the bread of life (explicit in vv. 35.48.51) means that Jesus in person, with his words and deeds, is the bread of life that has come down from heaven. To obtain life, one has to come to him, to believe in him (v. 35). "To eat of the bread" (vv. 50.51) has here a metaphorical sense; it is equivalent to believing

menti negli scritti giovannei (ed. P.-R. TRAGAN) (Studia Anselmiana 90, Sacramentum 8; Rome 1985) 121-133; L. SCHENKE, "Die literarische Vorgeschichte von Joh 6,26-58", *BZ NF* 29 (1985) 68-89; H. WEDER, "Die Menschwerdung Gottes. Überlegungen zur Auslegungsproblematik des Johannesevangeliums am Beispiel von Joh 6", *ZTK* 82 (1985) 325-360, esp. 328-329, 347-351; D.G. MEADE, *Pseudonymity and Canon. An Investigation into the Relationship of Authorship and Authority in Jewish and Earliest Christian Literature* (WUNT 39; Tübingen 1986) 110-114; C. BURCHARD, "The Importance of Joseph and Aseneth for the Study of the New Testament: A General Survey and a Fresh Look at the Lord's Supper", *NTS* 33 (1987) 102-134, esp. 119-120; U. SCHNELLE, *Antidoketische Christologie im Johannesevangelium. Eine Untersuchung zur Stellung des vierten Evangeliums in der johanneischen Schule* (FRLANT 144; Göttingen 1987) 214-228; P. STUHLMACHER, "Das neutestamentliche Zeugnis vom Herrenmahl", *ZTK* 84 (1987) 1-35, esp. 24-32; L. WEHR, *Arznei der Unsterblichkeit. Die Eucharistie bei Ignatius von Antiochien und im Johannesevangelium* (NTAbh NF 18; Münster 1987) 182-277; J. KÜGLER, *Der Jünger, den Jesus liebte. Literarische, theologische und historische Untersuchungen zu einer Schlüsselgestalt johanneischer Theologie und Geschichte. Mit einem Exkurs über die Brotrede in Joh 6* (SBB 16; Stuttgart 1988) 180-232 (vv. 48-58 constitute the eucharistic passage); C.H. COSGROVE, "The Place where Jesus is: Allusions to Baptism and the Eucharist in the Fourth Gospel", *NTS* 35 (1989) 522-539; P. DSCHULNIGG, "Überlegungen zum Hintergrund der Mahlformel in JosAs. Ein Versuch", *ZNW* 80 (1989) 272-275, esp. 275; J.-M. SEVRIN, "L'écriture du IV^e évangile comme phénomène de réception: L'exemple de Jn 6", *The New Testament in Early Christianity* (ed. J.-M. SEVRIN) (BETL 86; Leuven 1989) 69-83; PH. ROULET - U. RUEGG, "Étude de Jean 6: la narration et l'histoire de la rédaction", *La communauté johannique et son histoire. La trajectoire de l'évangile de Jean aux deux premiers siècles* (eds. J.-D. KAESTLI et al.) (MDB; Geneva 1990) 231-247, esp. 238, 246-247; J. BEUTLER, "Zur Struktur von Johannes 6", *SNTU* 16 (1991) 89-104, esp. 89, 102.

in Jesus⁽⁴⁾. This part of the discourse may have faint eucharistic undertones, but its primary intention is to make christological statements.

For some scholars, the supposed difference between the two parts of the discourse has been a reason to consider vv. 51c-58 as an addition by a redactor⁽⁵⁾. They consider the difference to be so strong that it is impossible that the two parts come from the same pen. Others solve the presumed tension by supposing that vv. 51c-58 are traditional material, incorporated by the evangelist⁽⁶⁾, or, conversely, by ascribing vv. 51c-58, and sometimes other parts of the discourse as well, to the evangelist and the rest of the discourse to a source used by him⁽⁷⁾. For others again, the differences are not so great that the two parts of the discourse should be ascribed to different literary levels, but great enough to think that the evangelist wrote them at different times and with different aims⁽⁸⁾.

However, beside the eucharistic interpretation of John 6,51c-58, there has always been another approach to this passage. Many interpreters have read it as a logical continuation of the preceding christological part of the discourse, a continuation which also contains a christological message. In this approach, the terms "bread", "flesh" and "blood" in vv. 51c-58 refer, primarily at least, to the person of Jesus, and not to the eucharistic elements. It finds support in the "I am"-saying of 6,35: "I am the bread of life. Who comes to me, shall not hunger, and who believes in me, shall never thirst". This saying suggests that "to eat" and "to drink" metaphorically indicate belief in Jesus. Another keystone is found in vv. 57-58, where Jesus' flesh and blood, mentioned in vv. 53-56, are replaced first by "me" in v. 57, and then by "the bread which came down from heaven" in v. 58, which brings us back to vv. 35-51b. It is true that the exegetes who read vv. 51c-58 in this way differ in the degree to which they are willing to accept secondary eucharistic undertones

(4) A few scholars take it here in the literal sense and, consequently, have the eucharistic part of the discourse start with v. 48 or 49; see n. 3.

(5) So the authors listed by ROBERGE, "Discours", 278-289, and also Becker, Gnlika, Von Wahlde, Dockx, Weder, Wehr as mentioned in n. 3.

(6) So those mentioned by ROBERGE, "Discours", 289-292.

(7) So Schenke, Schnelle, Kügler, Sevrin, Roulet and Ruegg as mentioned in n. 3.

(8) So the scholars enumerated by ROBERGE, "Discours", 293-298, and also Légasse, Cosgrove as mentioned in n. 3.

in the passage, but they agree in considering it as first and foremost making christological statements⁽⁹⁾. An intermediate position is that 6,51c should be understood as christological, being about Jesus' death, and 6,53-58 as eucharistic⁽¹⁰⁾, but this position is not tenable, since v. 51c is consistent with what follows⁽¹¹⁾.

⁽⁹⁾ ROBERGE, "Discours", 266-272, distinguishes in the period since the end of the 19th century between three types: a) "interprétation sapientielle excluant toute référence à l'eucharistie" (F. Godet, H. Cremer, B.F.W. Bugge, B. Weiss, J. Kreyenbühl, P.W. Schmiedel, K. Bornhäuser, H. Odeberg, A. Schlatter, H.H. Huber, M. Barth, M. Blanchard, F.J. Moore, W. Cadman, M. Rissi); b) "interprétation sapientielle avec terminologie eucharistique" (H. Strathmann, J.D.G. Dunn, F. Schnider and W. Stenger); c) "interprétation sapientielle avec enseignement indirect sur l'eucharistie" (B.F. Westcott, R.H. Strachan, J.H. Bernard, P. Borgen, L. Morris, B. Lindars, F.J. Moloney, L. Goppelt). For the period until 1900, see LINDIJER, *Sacramenten*, 9-37. Recently, the christological interpretation has also been defended by J. WILLEMSE, *Het vierde evangelie. Een onderzoek naar zijn structuur* (Hilversum – Antwerpen 1965) 187-207 (type c); M. DE JONGE, *Jesus: Stranger from Heaven and Son of God. Jesus Christ and the Christians in Johannine Perspective* (SBLSPS 1; Missoula, MT 1977) 208 (type b); F.F. BRUCE, *The Gospel of John* (Grand Rapids 1983) 158-162 (type a); W. KIRCHSCHLÄGER, "Beobachtungen zur Struktur von Joh 6,48-58", *Für Kirche und Heimat* (FS. F. Loidl; [eds. J. BAUER et al.] Vienna 1985) 105-121 (type c, as it seems); W. WEREN, "Structuur en samenhang in Johannes 6", in W. BEUKEN et al., *Brood uit de hemel. Lijnen van Exodus 16 naar Johannes 6 tegen de achtergrond van de rabbijnse literatuur* (Kampen 1985) 44-61, esp. 47 (type a); G.R. BEASLEY-MURRAY, *John* (WBC 36; Waco, TX 1987) 93-96, 98-99 (type c); H.N. RIDDERBOS, *Het evangelie naar Johannes. Proeve van een theologische exegese I* (Kampen 1987) 274-284 (type a); M.M. THOMPSON, *The Humanity of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel* (Philadelphia 1988) 44-48 (type b); J. PAINTER, "Tradition and Interpretation in John 6", *NTS* 35 (1989) 421-450, esp. 442, n.2, 444-445 (type b; see now also id., *The Quest for the Messiah. Studies of the History, Literature and Theology of the Johannine Community* [Edinburgh 1991] 236, n.79, 239); D.A. CARSON, *The Gospel according to John* (Grand Rapids 1990) 276-280, 295-299 (type b); KOESTER, "John Six", 419-437 (type a).

⁽¹⁰⁾ Represented by H. SCHÜRMANN, "Joh 6,51c — ein Schlüssel zur großen johanneischen Brotrede", *BZ NF* 2 (1958) 244-262; id., "Die Eucharistie als Repräsentation und Applikation des Heilsgeschehens nach Joh 6,53-58", *TTZ* 58 (1959) 30-45, 108-118.

⁽¹¹⁾ So rightly J.D.G. DUNN, "John VI — A Eucharistic Discourse?", *NTS* 17 (1970-71) 328-338, esp. 329-330, 334-335. Many of Schürmann's arguments for a christological understanding of 6,51c return in my own reasoning below, but then applied to 6,51c-58.

After some preliminary remarks on the Johannine character of 6,51c-58 and on the use of traditional materials in this passage, I shall in this paper re-examine the arguments usually advanced for the eucharistic interpretation of these verses. It is often more presupposed than proven that John 6,51c-58 is about the Eucharist. It seems to me that the changes as regards content, which U. Schnelle, who may be considered in this respect as representative of many scholars, discerns in vv.51c-58 when compared with what precedes⁽¹²⁾, are actually the arguments for a eucharistic interpretation:

a. In the part of the discourse on the bread of life up to and including v. 51b, Jesus himself is the bread that came down from heaven, whereas in the part which starts with v. 51c, Jesus' flesh and blood are the bread from heaven.

b. In John 6,32, the Father gives (δίδωσιν) the bread from heaven; in 6,51c, Jesus will give (δώσω) the bread.

c. In the first part of the discourse, the eating of the bread (φαγεῖν) can only be understood in a symbolic way; in vv.51c-58, however, φαγεῖν and τρώγειν, "to eat", have to be understood literally.

d. In the first part, the issue is Jesus' heavenly provenance, but from v. 51c onwards, it is his corporality and humanity⁽¹³⁾.

In what follows, I shall discuss these four presumed changes. I shall closely consider the terminology of 6,51c-58 and the literary and theological structures of the discourse on the bread of life, and compare these structures with similar structures elsewhere in John. The connection, in v. 51, between vv.51c-58 and the preceding part of the discourse, deserves special attention. It will appear then that the former two of the presumed changes do not really support a eucharistic interpretation of vv.51c-58, and that the latter two are no real changes. The thrust of 6,51c-58 will appear to be primarily christological and not eucharistic. That is not to deny that eucha-

⁽¹²⁾ SCHNELLE, *Antidoketische Christologie*, 221-222.

⁽¹³⁾ Schnelle adds a fifth change: in vv.51c-58, human activity is of importance (vv. 54.56), which is not, in his view, the case in what precedes. This change has, however, no independent weight. The human activity in question is to eat Jesus' flesh and to drink his blood; whether the verbs "to eat" and "to drink" in vv.51c-58 should be understood as indicating human activity in Schnelle's sense, depends upon whether they are interpreted literally or metaphorically, i.e., upon c.

ristic undertones can be heard in 6,51c-58 (and in ch. 6 as a whole), or that, conversely, the sacrament of the Eucharist implies a christological statement. The alternative put in the title of this paper amounts to the question whether or not the fourth evangelist explicitly deals with the Eucharist in 6,51c-58. Point d. will confront us with the question of the setting of the passage in Johannine Christianity: does it belong in a discussion with Jews (as v. 52 suggests) or with docetists, i.e., Christians who deny that the heavenly Son of God is fully identical with the man Jesus?

I. Preliminary Remarks

As we observed above, some scholars have serious doubts about the compatibility of the christological and — supposedly — sacramental parts of the discourse. They evidently presuppose that John 6,51c-58 has indeed a eucharistic meaning, and this view of the theological contents of the passage is then used as an argument for ascribing the two parts of the discourse to two different literary strata. Such a way of arguing runs a double risk: it is easily based on a superficial or even an incorrect view of the content of the text, and it does not sufficiently account for the possibility that the evangelist's logic does not simply coincide with the logic of the modern interpreter. Even if the presupposition about the eucharistic tenor of John 6,51c-58 is right — *quod est demonstrandum* —, there is still the probability that for the fourth evangelist (and not only for him) belief in Jesus and participation in the Eucharist are not mutually exclusive⁽¹⁴⁾.

To prove that vv. 51c-58 do not belong together with the rest of the discourse on the bread of life, objective literary arguments concerning vocabulary and style are required in the first place, and such arguments cannot be found. I refer here to the recently published work of E. Ruckstuhl and P. Dschulnigg on Johannine style, in which Ruckstuhl's earlier research is enlarged and improved⁽¹⁵⁾. On the basis of their criteria, John 6,51c-58 can be con-

⁽¹⁴⁾ The same is valid for the combination of present and future eschatology in John.

⁽¹⁵⁾ E. RUCKSTUHL – P. DSCHULNIGG, *Stilkritik und Verfasserfrage im Johannesevangelium*. Die johanneischen Sprachmerkmale auf dem Hintergrund des Neuen Testaments und des zeitgenössischen hellenistischen Schrifttums (NTOA 17; Freiburg/Schweiz – Göttingen 1991); for Ruckstuhl's

sidered as an average Johannine pericope, just as the preceding part of the discourse.

Of course, this state of affairs leaves open the possibility that the fourth evangelist used sources or traditions in composing his narration; it means that whatever materials he used, he incorporated them in a thorough fashion and put his own stamp on them. It seems probable that in the passage under discussion here, the evangelist used a version of the words spoken by Jesus at the Last Supper; this conclusion can be drawn from a comparison with the other known versions (Mark 14,22-24 // Matt 26,26-28 on the one hand, Luke 22,19-20⁽¹⁶⁾ and 1 Cor 11,24-25 on the other)⁽¹⁷⁾. The words καὶ ὁ ἄρτος δὲ ὃν ἐγὼ δώσω, “and the bread which I shall give” (v. 51c), make one think of καὶ ... ἄρτον ... ἔδωκεν, “and he gave bread”, in Mark 14,22 // Luke 22,19 (cf. Matt 26,26). John’s ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου ζωῆς, “for the life of the world” (v. 51c), resembles, in combination with the preceding δώσω, the words τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον, “given for you”, which Jesus said of his body according to Luke 22,19; we can also compare ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν in 1 Cor 11,24, and what Jesus said of his blood according to all three Synoptists, that it was shed ὑπὲρ (Matt: περὶ) πολλῶν, “for many” (Mark 14,24; Matt 26,28; Luke 22,20). That the ὑπὲρ-formula, which in fact qualifies the act of giving, follows ἡ σὰρξ μου, “my flesh”, could be explained by the influence of an account of the institution of the Eucharist (see the parallels just adduced)⁽¹⁸⁾. The pair ἡ σὰρξ μου / τὸ αἷμά μου, “my flesh / my blood” in John 6,53-56, parallels the pair τὸ σῶμά μου / τὸ αἷμά μου, “my body / my blood”, in the NT accounts of the institution of the Eucharist

earlier research, see his *Die literarische Einheit des Johannesevangeliums*. Der gegenwärtige Stand der einschlägigen Forschungen (Studia Friburgensia NF 3; Freiburg/Schweiz 1951; repr. as NTOA 5; Freiburg/Schweiz – Göttingen 1987).

⁽¹⁶⁾ The longer text of Luke 22,17-20 should be considered as the original one, see B.M. METZGER, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (London – New York 1971; ²1975) 173-177.

⁽¹⁷⁾ An extensive comparison can be found in SCHÜRMANN, “Joh 6,51c”, 245-249.

⁽¹⁸⁾ Cf. P. BORG, *Bread from Heaven*. An Exegetical Study of the Concept of Manna in the Gospel of John and the Writings of Philo (NTS 10; Leiden 1965; ²1981) 93-94. The variant readings in v. 51c in which the words ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου ζωῆς are immediately connected with δώσω, are efforts at creating a smoother text.

(and in Justin, *Apol.* 1.66.3). The terms σάρξ and αἷμα are used by other early Christian authors, notably Ignatius, to indicate the eucharistic elements (Ignatius, *Rom.* 7,3; *Philad.* 4; Justin, *Apol.* 1.66.2; σάρξ alone Ignatius, *Smyrn.* 7,1; cf. αἷμα alone 1 John 5,8). As Ignatius is probably not directly dependent upon John⁽¹⁹⁾, it is best to explain John's use of σάρξ and αἷμα as use of already extant terminology, not as his own creation⁽²⁰⁾.

So it seems reasonable to suppose that eucharistic language, and especially a version of the institution of the Eucharist, have influenced John 6,51c-58. This influence explains why the expressions "to eat someone's flesh" and "to drink someone's blood" do not have here the hostile meaning they have elsewhere (see, e.g., Ezek 39,17), and why drinking Jesus' blood is not considered as an unlawful practice (see, e.g., Lev 17,10-14)⁽²¹⁾. In the preceding part of the discourse, such clear eucharistic language is not found. There is no need to consider Jesus' words in 6,27 about "the food ... that lasts for eternal life, which the Son of Man will give you" as directly referring to the Eucharist; just as the saying in 4,14, they have to be understood on the metaphorical level⁽²²⁾. John's use of eucharistic language in 6,51c-58 does not mean, however, that the passage is about the Eucharist. Language derived from the celebration of the Eucharist can be used to make statements about subjects that have some relationship to the Eucharist, but are not identical with it. Ignatius for instance, speaks about his approaching and longed for martyrdom in obviously eucharistic terms: "I desire the bread of God, which is the flesh of Jesus Christ, who is from David's seed, and for drink I desire his blood, which is imperishable love" (*Rom.* 7,3)⁽²³⁾. The communion with Christ, which the martyr expects after his death, is here described in terms of the eucharistic communion, but it is not the same as the eucharistic communion. We have to reckon with the possibility that in a comparable way the fourth

⁽¹⁹⁾ See, e.g., C. K. BARRETT, *The Gospel according to St John* (London 1978; orig. 1955) 110-111.

⁽²⁰⁾ So also W. BAUER, *Das Johannesevangelium* (HNT 6; Tübingen 1933) 99; R. BULTMANN, *Das Evangelium des Johannes* (MeyerK; Göttingen 1941) 175, n. 4; WEHR, *Arznei*, 135, 242-245.

⁽²¹⁾ Cf. LÉGASSE, "Pain de vie", 259, n. 58.

⁽²²⁾ See R. SCHNACKENBURG, *Das Johannesevangelium* II (HTKNT 4/2; Freiburg 1971) 48-49.

⁽²³⁾ See on this passage WEHR, *Arznei*, 130-143.

evangelist makes use of eucharistic language to make christological statements; that is at least what most of the scholars mentioned in n.9 above think. The question whether they are right or not, can only be answered by a careful study of John 6,51c-58 in its present, Johannine context. We are apparently legitimized to consider the passage as part of the Johannine discourse on the bread of life, and the literary unity of the discourse suggests at least that it constitutes a unity on the level of contents as well.

II. The Terms “Flesh” and “Blood”

There is indeed a change in John 6,51c: the bread is now said to be Jesus' σάρξ, from v. 53 onwards combined with his αἷμα, whereas earlier in the discourse it was Jesus himself (vv. 35.48.51). Now this change can only be a fairly relative one, as there is again a change at vv. 56/57: σάρξ and αἷμα are in turn replaced by the 1st person singular, and this “I” is then again identified in v. 58, to close the circle of the discourse, with “the bread that came down from heaven”. This double shift suggests that σάρξ and αἷμα do not indicate the eucharistic elements, but qualify Jesus' person. We observed above that σάρξ and αἷμα can refer to the eucharistic elements, but this is by no means the usual way of using these words in Early Christianity. From a careful examination of all passages in John where σάρξ is used (apart from 6,51c-58: 1,13.14; 3,6; 6,63; 8,15; 17,2), M. M. Thompson concludes that the word “refers to the human realm in contrast to the divine and natural existence in contrast to the life given by the spirit”, and that “it also connotes what is material or bodily”⁽²⁴⁾; the same meaning can be found elsewhere in Judaism and Early Christianity⁽²⁵⁾. The circumstance that the word denotes man in his frailty and mortality makes it applicable to the dying Jesus: his death is the moment when he proves to be σάρξ (cf., e.g., 1 Pet 3,18; 4,1; *Barn.* 6,7; 7,5; Ignatius, *Smyrn.* 1,2). Incarnation (John 1,14) entails death (John 6,51c). The suspicion that σάρξ in v. 51c indeed refers to the crucified Jesus receives support from what follows: ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου ζωῆς. The preposition ὑπὲρ is often used in John and in other early Christian

⁽²⁴⁾ THOMPSON, *Humanity*, 49, 50.

⁽²⁵⁾ See E. SCHWEIZER, “σάρξ κτλ.”, *TWNT* VII, 98-151; A. SAND, “σάρξ”, *EWNT* III, 549-557.

literature, together with a following genitive, to indicate "for" whom or what Jesus' death has a salvific effect⁽²⁶⁾; frequently, ὑπέρ is connected, just as in John 6,51c, with the verb (παρα)διδόναι referring to Jesus giving himself⁽²⁷⁾. That John has Jesus here speak of "for the life of the world" instead of "for many" or some such formula, is easily explained by the context, in which Jesus identifies himself with the bread which is said to "give life to the world" (6,33)⁽²⁸⁾. So it is probable that ἡ σὰρξ μου in v. 51c refers to Jesus himself as a dying human being.

In vv. 53-56, σὰρξ is combined with αἷμα, "blood", a combination that is still out of place in v. 51c, where "bread" and "flesh" are identified, but that was already suggested in v. 35, where Jesus as the bread of life was said to satisfy hunger and thirst⁽²⁹⁾. When we rightly surmise that αἷμα as well here qualifies Jesus' person, it can only refer to his person as suffering a violent death. "Jesus' blood" often amounts, in early Christian language, to "Jesus' shed blood". Within the Fourth Gospel, this is the case in 19,34, where blood and water are said to flow from the pierced side of Jesus. In Rom 5,8-10, Jesus' death is mentioned in v. 8, then taken up in v. 9 in the words "in his blood", which are in turn in v. 10 taken up in another reference to Jesus' death. In Ignatius, *Smyrn.* 1,1, "the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ" is in parallel with "the blood of Christ"⁽³⁰⁾.

A few times, Jesus' σὰρξ and αἷμα are mentioned together and refer to his violent death, just as we surmise it to be the case in John 6,53-56. In Eph 2,13-14, it is said that the separation between Jew and Gentile has been removed, first ἐν τῷ αἵματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ, "in the blood of Christ" (v. 13), and then ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ, "in his flesh" (v. 14); in v. 16, these two references to Jesus' death on the

⁽²⁶⁾ See John 10,11.15; 11,50-52; 15,13; 17,19; 18,14, and elsewhere in the NT e.g. Mark 14,24 par.; Rom 5,6-8; 1 Cor 11,24; 15,3; 2 Cor 5,14-15; Heb 6,20; 1 Pet 2,21; 1 John 3,16.

⁽²⁷⁾ See Luke 22,19; Gal 1,4; 2,20; Eph 5,2.25; 1 Tim 2,6; Tit 2,14. According to Rom 8,32, God gave up his own Son "for us all".

⁽²⁸⁾ Cf. recently WEHR, *Arznei*, 247-248, who however considers the wording in v. 51c as imitation by the redactor.

⁽²⁹⁾ BEASLEY-MURRAY, *John*, 94, considers v. 53 "as a development of v 35 in the light of v 51".

⁽³⁰⁾ See further, e.g., Matt 27,24-25; Acts 20,28; Rom 3,25; Eph 1,7; Heb 13,12; 1 John 1,7; 5,6; Rev 5,9; 1 Clem. 7,4.

cross are taken up in διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ, "through the cross". In Col 1,20-22, we find a comparable parallelism: reconciliation has been brought about διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ σταυροῦ αὐτοῦ, "by the blood of his cross" (v.20), and ἐν τῷ σώματι τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ διὰ τοῦ θανάτου, "in the body of his flesh by his death" (v.22)⁽³¹⁾. This way of speaking, in which "flesh" and "blood" refer to a human being who suffers a violent death, is also found in the OT and in the Jewish environment of Early Christianity⁽³²⁾. It should be distinguished from the standard expression "flesh and blood" used to indicate man as an earthly being⁽³³⁾.

So from v. 51c onward Jesus' flesh and blood are identified with the bread from heaven. That is not, however, a change over against what precedes but an intensification of it: Jesus is the bread from heaven, not just as a human being, but as a human being who dies on the cross⁽³⁴⁾.

There is one major difference between John 6,51c and Jesus' eucharistic words at the Last Supper as reported by the Synoptists and by Paul, which constitutes, to my mind, a very effective argument against the eucharistic interpretation of "flesh" and "blood" in John 6,51c-58. It is the circumstance that ὁ ἄρτος in v. 51c has already been qualified in what precedes as Jesus himself⁽³⁵⁾, whereas in Mark 14,22 parr.; 1 Cor 11,24; Justin, *Apol.* 1.66.3, the word τοῦτο in the clause τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου (or μου τὸ σῶμα), "this is my body", refers to the piece of bread Jesus has just taken in his hands. In the accounts of the Last Supper Jesus identifies a piece of bread with his body, but in John 6,51c he identifies the bread with which he already identified himself in a metaphorical way (6,35.48.51), with his dead self. There is, in the discourse on the bread of life in John 6, a movement of increasing unambiguity. In

⁽³¹⁾ See also *1 Clem.* 49,6; Ignatius, *Trall.* 8,1; *Smyrn.* 12,2; *Barn.* 5,1.

⁽³²⁾ See, e.g., Ps 79,2-3, quoted in 1 Macc 7,17; Ezek 32,5-6; 4 Macc 6,6.

⁽³³⁾ E.g., Sir 14,18; Matt 16,17; Gal 1,16; cf. G. RICHTER, "Zur Formgeschichte und literarischen Einheit von Joh 6,31-58", in id., *Studien zum Johannesevangelium* (ed. J. HAINZ) (BU 13; Regensburg 1977) 88-119, esp. 109-110 (orig. in *ZNW* 60 [1969] 21-55).

⁽³⁴⁾ So also, e.g., DUNN, "John VI", 331.

⁽³⁵⁾ See SCHÜRMANN, "Joh 6,51c", 252, and the clarifying outline in KÜGLER, *Jünger*, 207 (K. does not, however, draw the necessary consequences from his observation). Cf. also CARSON, *John*, 295.

the conversation between Jesus and the crowd in vv.22-34, the identification of Jesus with the bread of life remains implicit (vv. 27.29.32-33). In vv.35-51b, Jesus explicitly identifies himself with the bread from heaven (vv.35.48.51). In v.51c, the expression *kai ... δέ* marks what follows in vv.51c-58 as an addition, in this case a specification, in comparison to what has been said before: the bread of life is Jesus crucified⁽³⁶⁾. A eucharistic interpretation of "flesh" and "blood" in vv.51c-58 fails to appreciate both the connecting function of v.51c and the structure of the entire discourse.

Other discourses of Jesus in John exhibit a comparable movement: they also end in a reference to Jesus' death and its salvific meaning. Jesus' dialogue with Nicodemus on the birth from above (3,1ff.) turns into Jesus' word on the "lifting up" of the Son of Man, so that the believer may have eternal life (vv.14-15; cf. 12,32-33; 18,32). The discourse on the shepherd in John 10,1-18 starts with a *παροιμία* on the shepherd and his sheep (vv.1-6), which is followed by a section in which Jesus identifies himself with "the door" (vv.7-10). Then Jesus presents himself in vv.11-18 as "the good shepherd", and here we find a series of increasingly clear indications of his death: the first in v.11, that "the good shepherd gives his life for the sheep", in the 3rd person; these words are repeated in the 1st person in v.15, and finally Jesus speaks quite overtly and without any image, of giving his life and taking it back in vv.17-18. Another example of the same movement may be found in 4,1-42, the dialogue of Jesus and the Samaritan woman; at the end of this passage, Jesus speaks to his disciples of accomplishing his Father's work (v.34), which can only mean his death (cf. 19, 28-30)⁽³⁷⁾. We can observe this movement also in John's account of Jesus' public ministry (chs.2-12) as a whole: Jesus' final words (apart from the summary of his preaching in 12,44-50, which lacks a

⁽³⁶⁾ On this tripartite structure of the discourse on the bread of life, see M.J.J. MENKEN, *Numerical Literary Techniques in John*. The Fourth Evangelist's Use of Numbers of Words and Syllables (NTS 55; Leiden 1985) 158-173.

⁽³⁷⁾ Cf. also 7,14-36, a series of dialogues which is situated on one day (see vv.14.37) and ends in Jesus' enigmatic saying about his return to the one who sent him (vv.33-36); 7,37-8,30, a series of connected dialogues as well, containing allusions to Jesus' death and its meaning which become increasingly more overt (7,39; 8,14.21) and end, just as was the case in ch.3, with the "lifting up" of the Son of Man (8,28).

setting) are those in 12,23-36, which deal entirely with the signification of his death. Of course, the gospel as a whole also displays this structure, as it ends in Jesus' death and resurrection (chs. 18-21), preceded by the account of Jesus washing the disciples' feet and his farewell discourses, which reveal the signification of these events (chs. 13-17). We can conclude that the development of the discourse on the bread of life sketched above fits in very well with the development of several other discourses in John and of this gospel as a whole.

III. Jesus as the Future Giver of the Bread

It may seem at first sight that the above is contradicted by the fact that Jesus is depicted in John 6,51c as the one who will give the bread, whereas in the preceding part it was the Father who gave the bread (which is Jesus); should not "the bread which I shall give" refer to the eucharistic bread?

Such an interpretation is made impossible first of all by the observation made above, that ὁ ἄρτος in v.51c has already been qualified as Jesus himself. The words ὃν ἐγὼ δώσω have to refer then, not to Jesus distributing bread at the Last Supper (which is not narrated in John) or, as the risen Lord, in the celebration of the Eucharist, but to Jesus giving himself in his death. The same has to be valid for the food, to be given by the Son of Man, in 6,27. These words announce in a veiled way what will be said more overtly in the final part of the discourse.

It can be shown in addition, that this understanding of v.51c, necessary because of its context, is quite in line with a basic structure of Johannine christology. In the Fourth Gospel, the Father sends or gives the Son, Jesus, and this action reaches its goal not just in Jesus' incarnation, but in his death. God's giving of Jesus reaches its goal in Jesus' giving of himself. Outside of ch. 6, the Father is said to give Jesus in 3,16: "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only Son, that everyone who believes in him should not perish but have eternal life". Here, ἔδωκεν, "he gave", is parallel to ἀπέστειλεν, "he sent", in 3,17: "For God did not send his Son into the world that he should condemn the world, but that the world should be saved through him". Both the words "God gave his only Son" and "God sent his Son" are parallel to "the Son of Man must be lifted up" in 3,14, an evident reference to his death (note also the causal

conjunction γάρ at the beginning of vv. 16.17). That Jesus' salvific death is the goal of the Father giving or sending him because of his love for the world is also clearly stated in 1 John 4,9-10⁽³⁸⁾.

According to John 4,34, Jesus says: "My food is that I do the will of the one who sent me, and accomplish his work". The accomplishment of the Father's work consists in Jesus' death (see 19,28-30), which is then the realization of the will of his sender (see also 17,4).

In 10,36, Jesus says that the Father has sanctified him and sent him into the world; in 17,19, he says that he sanctifies himself for his disciples, which must refer to his imminent death⁽³⁹⁾. In 17,18-19, it is suggested that the Father's sending of Jesus is continued in Jesus' act of sanctifying himself, his death. John's use of ἀγιάζειν, "to sanctify", in 10,36; 17,19 exactly parallels his use of δίδοναι in 6,32.51: the Father gives or sanctifies Jesus in sending him; Jesus gives or sanctifies himself by fulfilling his Father's will in his death.

The same structure can be discerned in John in passages about the love of the Father and the Son. As the Father has loved the Son, so the Son has loved his disciples (15,9-10), and this love of the Son manifests itself in that he gives his life for his own (15,12-13; cf. 17,23.26). According to 3,16, the love of the Father reaches its climax in the death of the Son (see above). The love of the Father for the Son is on the one hand prior to creation (17,24; cf. 3,35; 5,20); on the other hand, the Father loves the Son because the Son gives his life and takes it again (10,17-18). The love of the Son for his own realizes itself during his earthly ministry (see, e.g., 11,5; 13,23), but it culminates in his death (13,1; 15,12-13).

We touch here on a peculiar feature of the Fourth Gospel: both Jesus' incarnation and his death are considered as salvific events (cf., e.g., 5,21 and 10,28 with 3,14-17 and 14,19, or 5,22 and 9,39 with 12,31 and 16,8.11). This feature can be explained by the circumstance that for the evangelist Jesus' death is the moment when the incarnation reaches its goal. Such a view is consistent with the situation of the (believing) readers or hearers of the gospel: they are no eyewitnesses of Jesus' ministry, but they look back after the event on the whole of Jesus' work, from the incarnation up to and including

⁽³⁸⁾ See E. SCHWEIZER, "Was meinen wir eigentlich, wenn wir sagen 'Gott sandte seinen Sohn ...'?", *NTS* 37 (1991) 204-224, esp. 212-216.

⁽³⁹⁾ See MENKEN, *Numerical Literary Techniques*, 265.

his cross and resurrection. They only know the earthly Jesus as the one who has also been crucified.

The structure of John's christology just sketched makes it clear that Jesus' act of giving himself as bread (6,51c) constitutes the climax of the Father's act of giving Jesus as bread (6,32). Jesus *gives* what he *is*: the bread of life. This idea, that Jesus gives what he is, can also be shown to be thoroughly Johannine. Several qualifications, which John attributes to Jesus' person, especially in "I am"-sayings, are at the same time qualifications of the gift that he brings. Jesus is life (11,25; 14,6)⁽⁴⁰⁾, and he gives life (5,21; 6,33; 10,28; 17,2). He is the resurrection (11,25), and raises (6,39.40.44.54). That he is the resurrection and the life, is demonstrated in his act of raising Lazarus (11,1-44; cf. 12,1.9.17), and also in other signs (4,46-54; 5,1-9). He is light (1,9; 8,12; 9,5)⁽⁴¹⁾, and he gives light (1,5.9), which is demonstrated in the healing of the man born blind (ch.9). Jesus is the truth (14,6)⁽⁴²⁾, and he speaks the truth (8,40.45.46; 16,7). He is God's word (1,1.14), and speaks God's word or words (3,34; 14,10.24; 17,8.14)⁽⁴³⁾. The evangelist may have found a model for this way of presenting Jesus as both bread and giver of bread in Jewish ideas about Wisdom. In Sir 24,19-21, Wisdom is portrayed both as the giver of food and drink, and as food and drink themselves⁽⁴⁴⁾. In *Det.* 115-118, Philo identifies Wisdom with the rock from Deut 32,13, which gives honey and oil, and then identifies the rock with the manna, the divine word, from which two cakes are made, one of honey, the other of oil (cf. Exod 16,31; Num 11,8), so that here as well, Wisdom is food and gives food⁽⁴⁵⁾. All these parallels to John 6,51 make clear that the transition from Jesus as bread to Jesus as the giver of bread remains within a christological framework.

⁽⁴⁰⁾ Cf. also 1,4; 5,26; 6,35.48.51.57.63.68.

⁽⁴¹⁾ Cf. also 1,4.8; 3,19-21; 12,35-36.46.

⁽⁴²⁾ Cf. also 1,14.17.

⁽⁴³⁾ Cf. also 12,48-50; 17,6.

⁽⁴⁴⁾ For Wisdom as giving food and drink, see also Prov 9,2-5; Sir 15,3. Wisdom is compared to water in *1 Enoch* 49,1.

⁽⁴⁵⁾ See K.-G. SANDELIN, "The Johannine Writings within the Setting of Their Cultural History", *Aspects on the Johannine Literature* (eds. L. HARTMAN – B. OLSSON) (ConBNT 18; Uppsala 1987) 9-26, esp. 19-20.

IV. Metaphorical or Literal Eating and Drinking?

It is evident that in John 6,50.51, "to eat of the bread of life" can only be understood in a metaphorical way: it stands for belief in Jesus (cf. 6,35). According to the eucharistic interpretation of 6,51c-58, "to eat" and "to drink" in vv. 52-58 have however to be understood literally. The usual argument is that τρώγειν has a more realistic meaning than simply "to eat"; it should mean "to chew". A secondary argument is that there is a difference between φαγεῖν ἐκ in vv. 50-51b and simple φαγεῖν or τρώγειν in vv. 51c-58⁽⁴⁶⁾.

A literal understanding of "to eat" and "to drink" in vv. 53-58 (for the moment, I leave aside the misunderstanding in v. 52; see below, under V) is possible only when "flesh" and "blood" indicate the eucharistic elements; when these terms here refer to the crucified Jesus, as has been demonstrated above, the verbs have to be understood in the same metaphorical way as "to eat" in vv. 50.51ab. "To eat Jesus' flesh and to drink his blood" then means: to believe in him as the one who dies for the life of the world. Or, in slightly different words: to believe that in Jesus' violent death God is acting for the life of the world. In vv. 48.50-51b both the verb "to eat" and its object "bread" are used metaphorically; in vv. 53-58 the verbs "to eat" and "to drink" are used metaphorically, but the objects "flesh" and "blood", or "me" (v. 57), are not. The metaphor is in part blown up by reality⁽⁴⁷⁾. Something similar already happened in 6,35. There, at the beginning of the central part of the discourse, we find a similar combination of metaphorical and literal language: "to come to me" and "to believe in me" are put together with the imagery of the satisfaction of hunger and thirst. I recall here an observation made above (under II) on John 10,1-18, the discourse on the shepherd: in its final part, we found a series of increasingly clear references to Jesus' death (vv. 11.15.17-18). There as well, there is a gradual decrease of metaphorical language and increase of literal language.

Another point is of importance here: in the case that literal eating and drinking were meant in 6,51c-58, one would expect in

⁽⁴⁶⁾ Given by SCHÜRMANN, "Joh 6,51c", 253-254; J.J. O'ROURKE, "Two Notes on St. John's Gospel", *CBQ* 25 (1963) 124-128, esp. 126-128; SCHNACKENBURG, *Johannesevangelium* II, 92.

⁽⁴⁷⁾ So also F. SCHNIDER – W. STENGER, *Johannes und die Synoptiker. Vergleich ihrer Parallelen* (Biblische Handbibliothek 9; Munich 1971) 163.

v. 56 the sequence: “I remain in him, and he in me”⁽⁴⁸⁾. The fact that the sequence is inverted (as elsewhere in John: 14,20; 15,4.5.7)⁽⁴⁹⁾ suggests, to my mind, that eating and drinking have to be understood here metaphorically.

That τρώγειν has a stronger sense than φαγεῖν is in itself not untrue, but not relevant in the present instance. For John, the two verbs are interchangeable. He simply uses τρώγειν as the present tense that corresponds to the aorist φαγεῖν⁽⁵⁰⁾, as it was quite common in later Greek⁽⁵¹⁾. The interchangeability of the two verbs is evident from the antithetic parallelism in 6,53-54, in which φάγητε and τρώγων are parallel, and from the quotation from Ps 41,10 in 13,18, where we find τρώγων where the LXX has ἐσθίων⁽⁵²⁾.

There is of course a slight difference between φαγεῖν + acc. and φαγεῖν ἐκ + gen., “to eat” and “to eat of”⁽⁵³⁾. However, the difference is not very essential, and it cannot be made a criterion for distinguishing between a eucharistic and a non-eucharistic meaning. In the eucharistic passage in 1 Cor 11, for instance, Paul speaks in vv. 26.27 of ἐσθίειν τὸν ἄρτον and πίνειν τὸ ποτήριον, and then in v. 28, without a discernible change of meaning, of ἐκ τοῦ ἄρτου ἐσθίειν and ἐκ τοῦ ποτηρίου πίνειν. Similarly in Mark 14,25 // Matt 26,28, in the account of the Last Supper: πίνειν ἐκ τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου, “to drink of the fruit of the vine”, is taken up in αὐτὸ πίνειν, “to drink it”⁽⁵⁴⁾.

⁽⁴⁸⁾ See X. LÉON-DUFOUR, *Lecture de l'Évangile selon Jean II* (Parole de Dieu; Paris 1990) 170-172; cf. M.-J. LAGRANGE, *Évangile selon saint Jean* (EB; Paris 1936; orig. 1925) 184-185.

⁽⁴⁹⁾ Considered as an argument for a Johannine incorporation of tradition in 6,51c-58 by E. SCHWEIZER, “Joh 6,51c-58 — vom Evangelisten übernommene Tradition?”, *ZNW* 82 (1991) 274.

⁽⁵⁰⁾ In a comparable way, his use of ἀποστέλλειν or πέμπειν is governed by the desired verbal form.

⁽⁵¹⁾ See LSJ, s.v. τρώγω III, and also L. GOPPELT, “τρώγω”, *TWNT* VIII, 236-237, who then, however, wrongly remarks that the change of verbal form can clarify the intention of the section 6,51c-58: the passage deals, in his view, with real, corporeal eating in the Eucharist.

⁽⁵²⁾ See M. J. J. MENKEN, “The Translation of Psalm 41.10 in John 13.18”, *JSNT* 40 (1990) 61-79, esp. 65.

⁽⁵³⁾ Both expressions are used in John 6 (vv. 23.26.31bis.49.50.51.52.53).

⁽⁵⁴⁾ See also, e.g., Luke 22,16 with v.l.; 1 Cor 9,7, and Exod 12 and Lev 22 LXX.

In v. 55, Jesus' flesh is said to be ἀληθὴς βρῶσις, "true food", and his blood ἀληθὴς πόσις, "true drink". The adjective does not mean that Jesus' flesh and blood are food and drink in the literal sense of the word, but that they achieve what food and drink ought to achieve. Just as food and drink procure life, so Jesus' flesh and blood procure eternal life (cf. v. 54)⁽⁵⁵⁾. One could almost translate ἀληθὴς with "trustworthy", just as in John 3,33; 5,31-32 for example. So the "food" and "drink" of v. 55 should be interpreted on the same metaphorical level as "eating" and "drinking".

V. John 6,51c-58 as a Discussion with Jews

It is often supposed that the eucharistic statements of John 6,51c-58 are statements which imply an anti-docetic christology: the real consumption of Jesus' flesh and blood implies his real humanity. Because he is a real human being, his flesh and blood can be consumed in the eucharistic celebration. Ignatius, *Smyrn.* 7,1 is often referred to in this context; according to this passage, the Docetists stay away from the celebration of the Eucharist and from the communal prayer, "because they do not confess that the Eucharist is the flesh of our saviour Jesus Christ, that has suffered for our sins". Here, a link between a docetic christology and avoidance of the Eucharist is indeed evident⁽⁵⁶⁾.

The christology of the preceding part of the discourse differs from this supposed anti-Docetism. In that part, the evangelist wants to demonstrate that the man Jesus is the bread from heaven. The murmuring of "the Jews" about the claim of Jesus, the son of Joseph, whose parents they know, to be the bread from heaven (6,41) exactly formulates the issue under discussion. The same point of discussion is at stake, in various terms, in other disputes between Jesus and the Jews in John (see, e.g., 5,17-18; 7,25-31; 10,22-39). We may surmise that these disputes in John's Gospel reflect disputes

⁽⁵⁵⁾ The *v.l.* ἀληθῶς probably arose because "superficially the adjective ἀληθὴς appears to be inappropriate", so METZGER, *Textual Commentary*, 214. See further the discussion in F. NEIRYNCK et al., *Jean et les synoptiques*. Examen critique de l'exégèse de M.-É. Boismard (BETL 49; Leuven 1979) 211-213, and LÉON-DUFOUR, *Jean* II, 166.

⁽⁵⁶⁾ A positive relationship between "orthodox" christology and the Eucharist may be discerned in Ignatius, *Eph.* 20,2 and *Rom.* 7,3, see WEHR, *Arznei*, 164-165. See also Justin, *Apol.* 1.66.2.

between Johannine Christians and their Jewish environment. John 6,51c-58, when interpreted as an anti-docetic passage, is different, because the issue is here in that case that Jesus, the bread from heaven, is really human. The views of Jesus held by the Johannine Jews and the Docetists are poles apart: the Jews know that Jesus is a fully human being, and therefore he cannot be the Son of God; the Docetists know that he is the Son of God, and therefore he cannot be a fully human being.

In the anti-docetic interpretation of John 6,51c-58, which is not strictly bound to the eucharistic interpretation⁽⁵⁷⁾, the objection of the Jews in v. 52 becomes problematic, because it seems that it does not represent here the Jewish point of view but the docetic one⁽⁵⁸⁾: it seems to express doubt about Jesus' capacity to give his flesh to eat, i.e., doubt about Jesus' real humanity. V. 59 ("Jesus said these things in the synagogue, teaching, at Capernaum") seems also to be out of place, when an anti-docetic passage has immediately preceded it. The questions that arise are then: when we interpret John 6,51c-58 as a primarily christological text on the necessity of accepting Jesus' death, what then remains of its presumed anti-docetic character, and is it then possible to understand v. 52 as a Jewish objection, just as it presents itself?

On the basis of what we observed above (under II and III), we can say that the tenor of John 6,53-58 is that belief in Jesus as the one in whose death God is acting is necessary to obtain eternal life. Jesus not only came down from heaven; his descent is brought to completion in his death, and he has to be accepted as come down

(57) As is proved by authors who interpret John 6,51c-58 as anti-docetic but not eucharistic, such as BORGES, *Bread from Heaven*, 147-192 (who interprets John 6,31-58 in its entirety as anti-docetic) and DUNN, "John VI", 335-338, and by authors who interpret the passage as eucharistic but not anti-docetic, such as BECKER, *Johannes I*, 222-223 and KÜGLER, *Jünger*, 221-226.

(58) COSGROVE, "Place", 527-530, is aware of the problem "that the ostensible audience does not seem to match up with the implied audience of Jesus' words" (527), but does not solve it by considering "secret believers" as the implied audience. U. WILCKENS, "Der eucharistische Abschnitt der johanneischen Rede vom Lebensbrot (Joh 6,51c-58)", *Neues Testament und Kirche* (FS. R. Schnackenburg; [ed. J. GNILKA] Freiburg 1974) 220-248, esp. 236-243, also sees the problem, and solves it by considering the Jews in 6,41.52 as "paradigmatische Repräsentanten des Unglaubens" (236); this solution is too general.

from heaven “unto death, even death on a cross”, to use the words of Phil 2,8. In this connection, it is of importance that John has Jesus speak in v. 53 not of *his* flesh and blood, but of the flesh and blood of *the Son of Man*. In John, the title “Son of Man” characterizes Jesus as the one who came from God and has returned to God by way of his exaltation / glorification (see 3,13-14; 6,62; 8,28; 12,23.34; 13,31). Earlier in the discourse on the bread of life, the Son of Man has been said to be the one on whom “the Father, God, has set his seal” (6,27). So it is stated in v. 53 that in order to obtain life, one has to accept Jesus’ death as the death of the Son of Man who came from heaven and returned there⁽⁵⁹⁾. When we hear then in v. 54, the positive half of the parallelism 6,53-54, about “eating *my* flesh” and “drinking *my* blood”, we should keep in mind that Jesus has just presented himself as the Son of Man.

The above means that 6,53-58 is at least as much directed against a Jewish point of view as against a docetic one. As said above, the Jews are presented in John as people who know Jesus as a fully human being, who therefore cannot be the Son of God. It is only to be expected that they certainly cannot accept that God acts in Jesus’ death, which pre-eminently makes him into a fully human being⁽⁶⁰⁾. I here refer once more to the end of the discourse on the shepherd: there, Jesus speaks overtly of his death as the execution of God’s commandment, whereupon part of the Jewish audience reacts with the words: “He has a demon and is mad; why do you listen to him?” (10,17-20). One could also think of Paul’s words in 1 Cor 1,23, that “Christ crucified” is “a stumbling block to Jews” (cf. Gal 5,11; John 6,61).

The point is that in understanding such christological statements as: “My flesh and blood are the bread from heaven”, or: “The bread from heaven is my flesh and blood”, the decision about

⁽⁵⁹⁾ Cf. C. K. BARRETT, “Das Fleisch des Menschensohnes (Joh 6,53)”, *Jesus und der Menschensohn* (FS. A. Vögtle; [eds. R. PESCH – R. SCHNACKENBURG] Freiburg 1975) 342-354, esp. 352-353. That the title “Son of Man” was especially at home in the Eucharist (see e.g. BARRETT, “Fleisch”, 350-352; BECKER, *Johannes I*, 222; WEHR, *Arznei*, 252-254), is difficult to prove. Ignatius, *Eph.* 20,2, uses it in a eucharistic context, but interprets it as referring to Jesus’ humanity.

⁽⁶⁰⁾ Similarly H. STRATHMANN, *Das Evangelium nach Johannes* (NTD 4; Göttingen 1951) 123; SCHNIDER – STENGER, *Johannes und die Synoptiker*, 163-164; PAINTER, “Tradition”, 444-445 (= *Quest*, 239).

what is the subject and what is the predicate depends upon the knowledge the reader or hearer already has about the issue in question. A Jewish reader, and a Christian reader who is sensitive to Jewish propaganda, know that Jesus is a human being, who died on a cross, and they can either accept or reject the new information offered to them, that Jesus is "the bread from heaven". A docetic reader, however, already knows about the Son of God who is "the bread from heaven", and for him or her the new information to be accepted or rejected is, that this bread is fully identical with the crucified human being Jesus⁽⁶¹⁾.

So the basic christological content of John 6,51c-58, that the crucified Jesus is the bread from heaven, can in itself be directed against both a Jewish and a docetic point of view. Which of the two was originally aimed at, can only be decided by a look at John's Gospel as a whole. It is evident then that the dispute with the Jewish point of view has an important place in it, whereas a clear anti-Docetism is hardly discernible. Passages such as John 1,14 and 19,34-35 (a text which is notoriously difficult to interpret) are by no means certain witnesses of anti-docetic polemics. In the Johannine Epistles, such polemics are perceptible (see 1 John 4,2; 5,6; 2 John 7)⁽⁶²⁾, which suggests that some people in the Johannine community (or communities) interpreted John's Gospel in a docetic way⁽⁶³⁾.

(61) BORGES, *Bread from Heaven*, 183-192, rightly stresses that "the Jews" of John 6,41.52 sharply distinguish between the spiritual bread from heaven and the man Jesus, but his identification of these Jews with Docetists does not seem to be justified: the Johannine Jews deny Jesus' heavenly provenance, the Docetists deny his humanity that culminates in his death.

(62) It seems that for the opponents of 1 John it was not so much Jesus' humanity in general as his *death* that caused problems; see esp. 1 John 5,6. $\sigma\alpha\rho\acute{\xi}$ in 1 John 4,2 and 2 John 7 refers then to Jesus' death, as we presumed it to be the case in John 6,51c-58; see M. C. DE BOER, "The Death of Jesus Christ and His Coming in the Flesh (1 John 4:2)", *NT* 33 (1991) 326-346. In a different way L. SCHENKE, "Das johanneische Schisma und die 'Zwölf' (Johannes 6.60-71)", *NTS* 38 (1992) 105-121, problematically identifies the opponents in 1 John with the many disciples who leave Jesus in John 6,60-71; in their christology, Jesus would have been the Christ and Son of God only after his resurrection. Of course, 1 John 5,6 constitutes for him an insurmountable problem (see his p. 107).

(63) See M.J.J. MENKEN, "De christologie van het vierde evangelie. Een overzicht van resultaten van recent onderzoek", *NedTTs* 45 (1991) 16-33, esp. 25-27 (in discussion with SCHNELLE, *Antidoketische Christologie*, and THOMPSON, *Humanity*).

The struggle of the Johannine Christians with the Docetists postdates their conflict with the Jews.

We now have to test the presumption that the misunderstanding in v. 52 can be understood as a Jewish misunderstanding, comparable with other misunderstandings on the part of the Jews in John. There is here, first of all, a textual problem: should we read τὴν σάρκα or τὴν σάρκα αὐτοῦ? There are three good reasons to prefer the shorter reading: the longer text is easily understood as an explanation of the shorter one, it can be explained as an accommodation to ἡ σὰρξ μου in the preceding verse (cf. also vv. 53-56), and the shorter text makes better sense in the context. In v. 51c, Jesus says that he will give *his* flesh, the Jews misquote him in v. 52 by omitting the possessive, and Jesus corrects the omission in v. 53: they have to eat the flesh *of the Son of Man*⁽⁶⁴⁾.

As far as its wording is concerned, the misunderstanding in 6,52 resembles other misunderstandings in John: it starts with πῶς, "how" (cf., e.g., 3,4.9; 6,42; 8,33; 12,34), followed by δύναται, "can he" (cf. 3,4.9), and contains a slightly disdaining οὗτος, "that fellow" (cf. 6,42; 7,35; 12,34).

As regards its contents: it occurs frequently in the Fourth Gospel that the Jews misunderstand sayings of Jesus about his imminent death, and that Jesus does not try to remove their incomprehension. In 2,20, they understand Jesus' saying: "Destroy this temple, and in three days I shall raise it up" (2,19), to be about the Jerusalem temple instead of about Jesus' body (cf. 2,21). In 7,33-34, Jesus says to the Jews: "For a little longer I am with you, and I go to him who sent me. You will seek me and you will not find me, and where I am, you cannot come". The Jews do not understand these words; they only wonder whether he aims at the Diaspora with the place to where he will go and where they cannot find him (7,35-36). Something similar happens in 8,21-22, where Jesus says: "I go away and you will seek me, and you will die in your sin; where I am going, you cannot come" (v. 21); the Jews interpret his words as a plan to kill himself (v. 22). In 12,34, Jesus' saying that "the Son of Man must be lifted up" (12,32), is not understood by the Jews; they

(64) See further MENKEN, *Numerical Literary Techniques*, 139-140, and for instances of "misunderstanding by omission" in John: id., "Some Remarks on the Course of the Dialogue: John 6,25-34", *Bijdragen* 48 (1987) 139-149, esp. 142-144, on John 3,4; 6,28.41-42.52; 16,30.

suppose it to contradict what they heard from the Law, that "the Christ remains for ever".

In all these misunderstandings, the Jews attribute only a superficial meaning to what Jesus says about his imminent death and its significance. This also happens in 6,52: when Jesus says that the bread of life, which he will give, is his mortal flesh (6,51c), the Jews wonder "how this fellow can give the flesh to eat". A saying of Jesus in which he points, in more or less veiled terms, to his death is ridiculed by interpreting it in a grossly literal way⁽⁶⁵⁾. The flesh of the one who came down from heaven is made into "the flesh"; as noted above, the omission is corrected in the next verse, when Jesus speaks of "the flesh of the Son of Man".

I conclude that it is by no means necessary to consider John 6,51c-58 as an anti-docetic passage, and the misunderstanding of the Jews in 6,52 as a docetic misunderstanding; the entire passage 6,51c-58 has to be read primarily, in agreement with its context, both in ch. 6 and in John as a whole, as a discussion with a Jewish point of view concerning Jesus' death⁽⁶⁶⁾.

Concluding Remarks

John 6,51c-58 should be considered as an integral part of John 6. It is quite probable that the evangelist made use here of eucharistic terminology, especially of a version known to him of the words on the bread and the wine, spoken by Jesus at the Last Supper. However, that does not mean that the passage is primarily about the Eucharist. Jesus' "flesh" and his "blood" indicate here the crucified Jesus, and "the bread" mentioned in v. 51c is not the eucharistic bread, but the bread of life with which Jesus already identified himself. There is a logical transition, in v. 51c, from the Father's present gift of Jesus to Jesus' future gift of himself. Eating Jesus' flesh and drinking his blood in vv. 53-56 stand for belief in him as the one who dies for the life of the world. The entire passage, including the misunderstanding in v. 52, can be understood as a discussion with a Jewish point of view concerning Jesus' death. Numerous parallels, elsewhere in John, to

⁽⁶⁵⁾ Cf. R. A. CULPEPPER, *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel. A Study in Literary Design* (Foundations and Facets: New Testament; Philadelphia 1983) 156-157, 162-163.

⁽⁶⁶⁾ Cf. MEADE, *Pseudonymity*, 113.

the various aspects of John 6,51c-58 just mentioned, support this christological interpretation.

There is no reason to doubt that the Johannine Christians celebrated the Eucharist⁽⁶⁷⁾; the fact that John makes use of the words of institution in 6,51c, testifies to this practice. It is quite probable that a reader or hearer of this gospel, when hearing the passage discussed in this paper, also thought of the Eucharist as the occasion when he or she experienced in a tangible way his or her belief in the crucified Jesus. However, John puts the Eucharist in its proper place by focusing on that which gives meaning to this sacrament: Jesus' salvific death. John betrays no interest in church practices or structures in themselves; he tacitly presupposes them and concentrates on the person of Christ as their basis. The discourse in which Jesus identifies himself with the bread from heaven was an apt place for the evangelist to make use of eucharistic material in a christological perspective.

Finally, a few words have to be said about John 6,60-71, the passage that follows the discourse on the bread of life. As a consequence of the above, the division among the disciples related here should be considered as reflecting a schism in the Johannine community or communities between those who accepted the crucified Jesus as the bread from heaven and those who returned to the Jewish point of view. John 6,60-71 has often been considered as lacking connections with 6,51c-58: the cause of the disciples' offence in 6,60-65 is said to be Jesus' claim to have come down from heaven (cf. 6,41-42), to which the remark on his ascension (v. 62) points back, and the use of "flesh" in v. 63 is said to be different from that in 6,51c-58⁽⁶⁸⁾. However, that vv. 60-71 have no connections with vv. 51c-58, is not correct, not only because of v. 58, where we hear about "the bread come down from heaven", but also for other reasons.

The λόγος at which the disciples take offence (v. 60), is the entire preceding discourse. Jesus answers their offence with the anacoluthon: "Then what if you see the Son of Man ascend to

(67) That they were not familiar with the Eucharist is suggested by KOESTER, "John Six", 432-433.

(68) See esp. G. BORNKAMM, "Die eucharistische Rede im Johannes-Evangelium", *ZNW* 47 (1956) 161-169, esp. 166-168 (repr. in id., *Geschichte und Glaube I* [Ges. Aufsätze 3; BEvT 48; Munich 1968] 60-67).

where he was before?" (v. 62) Jesus' ascension to his Father is, in John, the inward significance which the believer perceives in the outward event of Jesus' death (see, e.g., 13,1; 16,28; 20,17)⁽⁶⁹⁾. Jesus' saying in v. 62 indicates the moment at which his preceding discourse will be verified, so that the suppressed words of the anacoluthon should be something like: "Will you then accept my words?" For those who, just as the Jews in vv. 41-42.52, cannot accept that in his life *and* death, Jesus is the bread that came down from heaven, his death will be the confirmation of his failure, and for them the scandal will be enhanced; for those who believe, his ascension to the Father will be the verification of his claim to be, in his life *and* death, the bread that came down from heaven, and for them the scandal will be removed⁽⁷⁰⁾.

In Jesus' saying: "It is the spirit that gives life, the flesh is of no avail" (v. 63), πνεῦμα and σὰρξ are apparently used as anthropological, not christological concepts. John's usage here makes the reader think of 3,6, and of Pauline passages such as Rom 8,4-17; Gal 5,16-26⁽⁷¹⁾. It seems we should distinguish, in the Fourth Gospel, between σὰρξ applied to Christ, and a more general, anthropological usage of the word. The latter occurs several times (1,13; 3,6; 6,63; 8,15)⁽⁷²⁾, and the two usages are of course related, because God's Son assumes *the* flesh (cf. 1,14), so that it becomes *his* flesh. In their misunderstanding in v. 52, the Jews try precisely to make *Jesus'* flesh into *the* flesh (see above). V. 63 continues the question of belief and unbelief that has been brought up in vv. 61-62. Jesus' discourse is "spirit and life" for the believer, but for the one who remains at the level of "the flesh" and who therefore cannot see in Jesus' flesh the flesh of the Son of Man, come down from and ascended to heaven, they are meaningless⁽⁷³⁾.

⁽⁶⁹⁾ In 20,17, the evangelist considers Jesus' death, resurrection and exaltation as one event; for the outsider, only the death is discernible.

⁽⁷⁰⁾ Cf., e.g., LÉON-DUFOUR, *Jean II*, 180-181.

⁽⁷¹⁾ V. 63a might well be a traditional saying, so, e.g., KÜGLER, *Jünger*, 192-193, 213-214.

⁽⁷²⁾ In 17,2, we meet the semitism πᾶσα σὰρξ, "all flesh", indicating mankind.

⁽⁷³⁾ I now think that the purely christological interpretation of 6,63a, which I gave, following many others, in *Numerical Literary Techniques*, 141, needs to be corrected. H. VAN DEN BUSSCHE, *Het Boek der Werken. Verklaring van Johannes 5-12* (Het vierde evangelie 2; Tiel - Den Haag 1960) 148; WILCKENS, "Der eucharistie Abschnitt", 243-245; RIDDERBOS, *Johan-*

Belief and unbelief as the answers to what Jesus said in his discourse continue to be the theme until the end of the chapter. Judas exemplifies the latter, Simon Peter, as the spokesman of the Twelve, the former. The mention of Judas' betrayal (vv. 64-71) brings Jesus' death once more to the fore. The title ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ, "the Holy One of God", which Peter attributes to Jesus in his confession in v. 69, may do the same. As we saw above (under III), John uses ἁγιάζειν, "to sanctify", in 10,36 and 17,19 to indicate the Father's sanctification of the Son in sending him unto death and the Son's continuation of this act in sanctifying himself by his death. So a possible explanation for the use of the singular title "the Holy One of God" in 6,69 could be that it characterizes Jesus as consecrated to death⁽⁷⁴⁾.

I conclude that John 6,60-71 fits in well with 6,51c-58, the closing passage of the preceding discourse, when we interpret this passage in the way proposed in this paper⁽⁷⁵⁾.

Bodemplein 23
NL - 6443 CJ Brunssum
The Netherlands

Maarten J. J. MENKEN

SOMMAIRE

Le thème majeur de Jn 6,51c-58, un passage composé par le quatrième évangéliste à l'aide de matériaux eucharistiques, est d'ordre christologique. Les termes « chair » et « sang » se réfèrent à la mort de Jésus sur la croix. Au v. 51c, « le pain » est le pain de vie avec lequel Jésus s'est déjà identifié lui-même, et le texte propose une transition entre le don présent de Jésus par le Père et le don futur que Jésus fera de lui-même dans sa mort. « Manger la chair de Jésus » et « boire son sang » aux vv. 53-56 sont des expressions qui signifient la foi en Jésus crucifié. Le passage tout entier, y compris l'incompréhension des Juifs au v. 52, peut être interprété comme une discussion à propos du point de vue juif sur la mort de Jésus. Cette interprétation christologique est corroborée non seulement par le contexte immédiat de Jn 6,51b-58, mais aussi par des textes parallèles dans l'évangile de Jean et dans des écrits du christianisme primitif.

nes I, 286-288, and KOESTER, "John Six", 431, who consider ch. 6 in its entirety as Johannine, also distinguish σάρξ in v. 63 from σάρξ in vv. 51c-58.

⁽⁷⁴⁾ Similarly SCHÜRMANN, "Joh 6,51c", 260; BEASLEY-MURRAY, *John*, 97.

⁽⁷⁵⁾ I thank Mrs. K. M. Court for correcting my English text.

Bürgerliches Christentum in den Pastoralbriefen? ⁽¹⁾

I

Wenn man sich nach der Lektüre der unbestritten echten Paulusbriefe, vor allem der beiden an die Korinther, zu den Pastoralbriefen wendet, fühlt man sich in eine andere Welt versetzt. Kein Wort mehr von den Geistesgaben wie der Gabe der Heilungen und der Wunderkräfte, der Gabe des prophetischen Redens oder der Zungenrede, wie Paulus sie in 1 Kor 12,8-10 aufzählt. Daß im Gottesdienst jeder etwas beizutragen hat, sei es "einen Psalm oder eine Lehre oder eine Offenbarung oder eine Zungenrede oder eine Auslegung" (der Zungenrede) (1 Kor 14,26), das scheint in der Gemeinde der Pastoralbriefe, zumindest auf den ersten Blick, undenkbar. Statt der Aufzählung von Charismen bieten die Pastoralbriefe eine Aufzählung von Ämtern: das Amt des ἐπίσκοπος, des "Aufsehers", der später zum Bischof geworden ist, das Amt des Presbyters und des Diakons. Das Charisma scheint weitgehend zum Amtcharisma geworden zu sein und wird durch die Handauflegung bei der Ordination verliehen⁽²⁾. In Ämterspiegeln werden die persönlichen Voraussetzungen aufgezählt, die für die Verleihung dieser Ämter erforderlich sind. So muß der ἐπίσκοπος "untadelig sein, nur mit *einer* Frau verheiratet, nüchtern, selbstbeherrscht, anständig, gastfreundlich, lehrtüchtig, kein Säufer und kein Schläger, vielmehr gütig, nicht streitsüchtig, nicht ins Geld verliebt; dem eigenen Haus muß er gut vorstehen und fügsame Kinder haben in aller Ehrbarkeit" (1 Tim 3,2-4). "Im Gesichtskreis der Pastoralbriefe scheint es Träger freien Geistes neben

⁽¹⁾ Vorgetragen im Rahmen des Habilitationskolloquiums in Tübingen am 24. November 1989 und in erweiterter Fassung als Vortrag in Mainz am 2. Mai 1990.

⁽²⁾ 1 Tim 4,14; 5,22; 2 Tim 1,6. Der Deutung von N. BAUMERT, "Charisma und Amt bei Paulus", *L'apôtre Paul. Personnalité, style, et conception du ministère* (Hrsg. A. VANHOYE) (BETL 73; Leuven 1986) 203-228, hier: 222-223, der χάρισμα auch an diesen Stellen im Sinne eines ganz unspezifischen "Geschenk" versteht, kann ich nicht folgen.

dem kirchlichen Amt nur noch als Ketzer zu geben", bemerkte einst Ernst von Dobschütz⁽³⁾.

Für Witwen, denen Paulus nur rät, sie sollen lieber noch einmal heiraten als "brennen" (1 Kor 7,8-9), gibt es nach 1 Tim 5 inzwischen eine Fürsorgeeinrichtung der Gemeinde mit genau festgelegten Aufnahmebedingungen:

Eine Witwe soll nur dann ins Verzeichnis eingetragen werden, wenn sie wenigstens 60 Jahre alt ist, nur *einen* Mann hatte und bekannt ist für gute Werke, wenn sie Kinder aufgezogen hat, Fremde beherbergt, die Füße der Heiligen gewaschen, den Bedrängten Hilfe geleistet hat und jedem guten Werk nachgegangen ist (1 Tim 5,9-10).

Die Institutionalisierung und Verrechtlichung der Kirche ist also gegenüber den paulinischen Gemeinden weit fortgeschritten.

Und wie das Charisma zum Amtcharisma, so scheint der Glaube ganz zur Rechtgläubigkeit geworden zu sein, zur "gesunden Lehre", die man gegen Irrlehrer verteidigen muß⁽⁴⁾. Bedeutete für Paulus der Glaube zunächst Gehorsam und entschiedenes Vertrauen auf den, der Christus von den Toten erweckt hat und uns "am Gesetz vorbei" (χωρίς νόμου) rechtfertigt⁽⁵⁾, so scheint der Glaube in den Pastoralbriefen vor allem darin zu bestehen, daß man "zur Erkenntnis der Wahrheit" gelangt, an der "gesunden Lehre" festhält und ein "reines" und "gutes Gewissen" bewahrt, "das gewisse Leute abgeschüttelt haben, so daß sie im Glauben Schiffbruch erlitten" (1 Tim 1,19)⁽⁶⁾.

Paulus erinnert die Thessalonicher daran, wie sie sich von den Götzen weg zu Gott bekehrt haben, um ihm zu dienen und seinen Sohn vom Himmel her zu erwarten, daß er sie dem kommenden Zorngericht entreiße (1 Thess 1,9-10). In den Pastoralbriefen dagegen scheint der Glaube ein "frommes Familienerbe" geworden zu sein⁽⁷⁾, das man von der Mutter und Großmutter übernommen hat

⁽³⁾ E. VON DOBSCHÜTZ, *Die urchristlichen Gemeinden*. Sittengeschichtliche Bilder (Leipzig 1902) 196.

⁽⁴⁾ 1 Tim 1,10; 6,3. Vgl. R. BULTMANN, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments* (Tübingen 1984) 487-490.

⁽⁵⁾ Röm 10,9; 3,21. Vgl. BULTMANN, *Theologie*, 315-324.

⁽⁶⁾ "Erkenntnis der Wahrheit": 2 Tim 2,25; 3,7; Tit 1,1. "Gesunde Lehre": 1 Tim 1,10; 2 Tim 4,3; Tit 1,9; 2,1. "Reines", "gutes Gewissen": 1 Tim 1,5.19; 3,9; 2 Tim 1,3.

⁽⁷⁾ N. BROX, *Die Pastoralbriefe* (RNT 7,2; Regensburg 1969) 226.

(2 Tim 1,5). Schon mit der Muttermilch — ἀπὸ βρέφους — lernt man die Heilige Schrift kennen, die “nützlich ist zur Lehre, zur Widerlegung, zur Besserung und zur Erziehung in der Gerechtigkeit” (2 Tim 3,15-16). Der Glaube ist etwas geworden, was man “bewahren” und an die nächste Generation weitergeben kann, ein depositum fidei⁽⁸⁾.

Auch das eschatologische Bewußtsein hat sich gewandelt. ὁ καιρὸς συνεσταλμένος ἐστίν, schreibt Paulus an die Korinther, “die Zeit ist gerafft” oder “kurz bemessen”; daher soll,

wer eine Frau hat, sein, als habe er keine, wer weint, als weine er nicht, wer sich freut, als freue er sich nicht, wer Besitz erwirbt, als besäße er ihn nicht, wer sich die Welt zunutze macht, als benutze er sie nicht; denn die Gestalt dieser Welt ist im Vergehen (παράγει) (1 Kor 7,29-31).

Einen anschaulichen Kommentar zum letzten Satz kann man bei A. Schweitzer finden: “Hinter dem stehengebliebenen äußeren Schein der natürlichen Welt ist ihre Verwandlung in die übernatürliche im Gange, wie die Bühne sich hinter dem Vorhang verändert”⁽⁹⁾. Der Paulus der Pastoralbriefe dagegen schreibt an Timotheus, er solle “das Gebot” (τὴν ἐντολὴν) unbefleckt und untadelig bewahren bis zur Erscheinung unseres Herrn Jesus Christus, die Gott “zu seiner Zeit” (καιροῖς ἰδίους) schauen lassen werde (1 Tim 6,14-15). Von einer Naherwartung ist hier nichts mehr zu spüren. Und weil die Zeit also nicht mehr “gerafft” ist, geht es in den Pastoralbriefen auch nicht so sehr darum, in dieser Welt zu leben, als lebe man nicht in ihr; die Christen wollen vielmehr “ein ruhiges und stilles Leben führen, in aller Frömmigkeit und Ehrbarkeit” (1 Tim 2,2). Sie haben “der Gottlosigkeit und den weltlichen Begierden abgesagt, um so selbstbeherrscht und gerecht und fromm leben zu können in der jetzigen Welt (ἐν τῷ νῦν αἰῶνι)” (Tit 2,12).

II

“Wir haben hier... den kirchlich verfestigten und katholisch temperierten Paulinismus vor uns...”, heißt es bei Heinrich Julius

⁽⁸⁾ 1 Tim 6,20; 2 Tim 1,12.14; 4,7. R. SCHNACKENBURG, *Die sittliche Botschaft des Neuen Testaments*. Band 2: Die urchristlichen Verkündiger (HTKNT Suppl. II/2; Freiburg 1988) 98.

⁽⁹⁾ A. SCHWEITZER, *Die Mystik des Apostels Paulus* (Tübingen 1930) 100: “...ist... im Gange”. Genau das ist mit dem Präsens παράγει in 1 Kor 7,31 gemeint.

Holtzmann im Jahr 1911⁽¹⁰⁾. Aber erst zwanzig Jahre später, nach den politischen, sozialen und geistigen Umwälzungen des 1. Weltkriegs und der Nachkriegsjahre, fand Martin Dibelius ein markantes Schlagwort für diese Art von Christentum. Sein 1931 erschienener Kommentar zu den Pastoralbriefen⁽¹¹⁾ enthält zu dem eben zitierten Vers 1 Tim 2,2 einen Exkurs über "das Ideal christlicher Bürgerlichkeit", das an dieser Stelle "in geläufigen Worten" geschildert werde. Statt von "christlicher Bürgerlichkeit" spricht Dibelius, aber auch von "bürgerlichem Christentum", das "keinerlei heroische Art" habe, vielmehr auf eine vom "kampfreichen Dasein des Paulus" scharf abstechende "geruhige Existenz" aus sei und sich "der Welt einzugliedern" wünsche. Dem entspreche auch das Ideal eines Lebens, aufgebaut auf dem Zeugnis des guten Gewissens und abzielend auf gute Werke, Glaube und Liebe, Frömmigkeit und Ehrbarkeit. Dazu gehöre weiter die 'besonnene' Mäßigung in der Einstellung zu den Lebensgütern, die die Askese der Gnostiker zwar verwirft, den mäßigen Weingenuß aber durchaus empfiehlt; die vor den Gefahren des Reichtums warnt, aber einen gewissen Besitz in der Gemeinde voraussetzt. Als "deutlichstes Zeichen einer Verchristlichung der Welt" aber erweise sich eine im Entstehen begriffene "Familienethik", die eine "religiöse Familientradition" kenne,

⁽¹⁰⁾ H. J. HOLTZMANN, *Lehrbuch der neutestamentlichen Theologie*. 2 Bde (Tübingen ²1911) II, 295. Vgl. ebd. I, 569: "In diesem Sinne also spricht man von einem abgeflachten, seiner Kanten und Spitzen entledigten, von einem popularisierten, praktisch gemachten und katholisch werdenden Paulinismus. Mehr oder weniger gehört hierher die ganze, unter der Kategorie 'Deuteropaulinismus' zu besprechende Literatur, voran die petrin. und die Past-Briefe, in welchen die kathol. Kirche sich schon fast leibhaftig anmeldet". Für Holtzmann scheint "katholisch" soviel wie "unpaulinisch" zu bedeuten (vgl. *Lehrbuch*, II, 316 zu 1 Tim 3,5: "so unpaulinisch und katholisch als möglich"). In einer Anmerkung weist Holtzmann auf A. Ritschl hin, der diesen Prozeß im wesentlichen als eine Degeneration werte, während O. Pfleiderer darin den Weg sehe, die christliche Gedankenwelt "anwendbar und fruchtbar zu machen" (*Lehrbuch*, I, 569, Anm. 1). Holtzmann neigt offenbar eher Ritschls Auffassung zu. Diese Sicht der Dinge fand ihren begrifflichen Ausdruck in der "Frühkatholizismus"-These. Dazu jetzt K. KERTELGE, "'Frühkatholizismus' im Neuen Testament als Herausforderung für die Ökumene", *Jesu Rede von Gott und ihre Nachgeschichte im frühen Christentum*. Beiträge zur Verkündigung Jesu und zum Kerygma der Kirche (FS W. Marxsen [Hrsg. D.-A. KOCH u.a.] Gütersloh 1989) 344-360. Die These vom "bürgerlichen Christentum ist in mancher Hinsicht nur eine Spielart der 'Frühkatholizismus'-These.

⁽¹¹⁾ M. DIBELIUS, *Die Pastoralbriefe* (HNT 13; Tübingen ²1931).

die Sorge für die bejahrten Familienglieder als besondere Christenpflicht betone, ebenso aber auch die Erziehung der Nachkommen zu gläubigen und gehorsamen Christen.

Diese Charakteristik fand in der französisch- und englischsprachigen Forschung nur geringen Anklang. C. Spicq führt sie in seinem großen Kommentar mit zurückhaltender Zustimmung an, betont aber sogleich, daß es sich hier gegenüber den übrigen Paulinen — er hält die Pastoralbriefe für authentisch — nur um Akzentverschiebungen handle, die durch die gewandelten Umstände bedingt seien.

La 'maison de Dieu' s'organise, ses membres sont plus nombreux et donc plus mélangés que jadis; l'Apôtre doit s'adapter à la médiocrité humaine, et après la justification initiale, se pose d'urgence le problème de l'éducation des croyants⁽¹²⁾.

Eine 1989 erschienene englische Dissertation dagegen kommt zu dem Ergebnis, die Charakteristik "bürgerlich" werde den Pastoralbriefen in keiner Weise gerecht⁽¹³⁾. Differenzierter, in der Hauptsache aber gleich, ist das Urteil Reggie M. Kidds, der die jüngste und gründlichste Untersuchung zu unserem Thema veröffentlicht hat⁽¹⁴⁾.

Ganz anders war die Resonanz auf die These von Dibelius in der deutschsprachigen Forschung. Siegfried Schulz hat in seiner "Neutestamentlichen Ethik" ein Kapitel über das "bürgerliche Christentum", in dem er die oben skizzierte Charakteristik ganz unkritisch rezipiert⁽¹⁵⁾. Andere übernehmen zwar das Schlagwort vom "bürgerlichen Christentum", machen aber gewisse Einschränkun-

⁽¹²⁾ C. SPICQ, *Les épîtres pastorales*, 2 Bde (EB; Paris 41969) I, 176. Vgl. I, 174-176, 292-297. Gute Darstellung bei R. M. KIDD, *Wealth and Beneficence in the Pastoral Epistles*. A "Bourgeois" Form of Early Christianity? (SBLDS 122; Atlanta 1990) 25-29.

⁽¹³⁾ Ph. H. TOWNER, *The Goal of our Instruction*. The Structure of Theology and Ethics in the Pastoral Epistles (JSNTSS 34; Sheffield 1989). Vgl. die Rezension von A. WEISER, *TLZ* 116 (1991) 284-285.

⁽¹⁴⁾ KIDD, *Wealth*. Hier findet man auch die längst fällige Bestimmung dessen, was M. Dibelius eigentlich unter "bürgerlich" in diesem Zusammenhang verstanden hat. Nach KIDD, *Wealth*, 25 dreierlei: sozial im Aufsteigen begriffen, kulturell zur Anpassung neigend und in der Ethik unheerisch konservativ.

⁽¹⁵⁾ S. SCHULZ, *Neutestamentliche Ethik* (Zürcher Grundrisse zur Bibel; Zürich 1987) 595-600.

gen: es handle sich dabei nicht um ein "selbstgenügsames Christentum" ⁽¹⁶⁾, um "'Verbürgerlichung' des Christentums im pejorativen Sinn" ⁽¹⁷⁾, um "Weltlichkeit oder Verweltlichung" ⁽¹⁸⁾. Hans Conzelmann hat in seiner Überarbeitung des Kommentars von Dibelius auch in dem besagten Exkurs Modifikationen angebracht und betont, daß diese Bürgerlichkeit nicht zur Weltfrömmigkeit entfaltet werde ⁽¹⁹⁾. Ähnlich meint Rudolf Schnackenburg: "Die zweifellos vorhandene Angleichung an die hellenistische Ethik führt zu einem vernünftigen bürgerlichen Leben, doch mit hohem Ethos..."; "Einbürgerung" in Gesellschaft und Welt müsse nicht Einebnung christlicher Tugenden und Einbuße christlicher Identität bedeuten ⁽²⁰⁾. Im großen und ganzen jedoch wird die Dibelius'sche Charakteristik von protestantischen wie von katholischen Exegeten zustimmend aufgenommen ⁽²¹⁾. Josef Schmid spricht in der von ihm überarbeiteten "Einleitung in das Neue Testament" von der "nüchternen Alltagsfrömmigkeit" der Pastoralbriefe und fährt dann fort:

Die Aufgabe des einfachen Christen ist ein frommer Wandel in einer friedlichen Zeit. Verfolgung und Martyrium sind nur für die Apostel

⁽¹⁶⁾ Ph. VIELHAUER, *Geschichte der urchristlichen Literatur*. Einleitung in das Neue Testament, die Apokryphen und die Apostolischen Väter (Berlin 1975) 234.

⁽¹⁷⁾ BROX, *Pastoralbriefe*, 125. Auch L. OBERLINER, "'Ein ruhiges und ungestörtes Leben führen'. Ein Ideal für christliche Gemeinden?", *Bibel und Kirche* 46 (1991) 98-106 versucht ein positives Verständnis dieses Schlagworts.

⁽¹⁸⁾ W. SCHRAGE, *Ethik des Neuen Testaments* (Grundrisse zum NT 4. NTD Ergänzungsreihe; Göttingen ²1989) 268.

⁽¹⁹⁾ M. DIBELIUS-H. CONZELMANN, *Die Pastoralbriefe* (HNT 13; Tübingen ³1955) 7.

⁽²⁰⁾ SCHNACKENBURG, *Sittliche Botschaft*, II, 103, 109. Ähnlich äußert sich J. ROLOFF, *Der erste Brief an Timotheus* (EKKNT 15; Zürich 1988) 384f.

⁽²¹⁾ Daran hat auch die allzu biedere Dissertation von R. SCHWARZ, *Bürgerliches Christentum im Neuen Testament? Eine Studie zu Ethik, Amt und Recht in den Pastoralbriefen* (Österreichische Bibelstudien 4; Klosterneuburg 1983) nichts geändert (vgl. SCHNACKENBURG, *Sittliche Botschaft*, II, 103, Anm. 151). BULTMANN, *Theologie*, 467-468 charakterisiert sowohl das Christentum der Pastoralbriefe als auch das der Apostelgeschichte als "christlich-bürgerliche Frömmigkeit". Auch das Christentum des Kolosser- und Epheserbriefs bezeichnet er als "ein frommes, von brüderlicher Liebe getragenes Leben in den Formen des bürgerlichen Daseins" (*Theologie*, 530).

und ihre Mitarbeiter bestimmt. Man pflegt ein solches Christentum als 'christliche Bürgerlichkeit' zu bezeichnen (Dibelius), und dies mit Recht⁽²²⁾.

III

Wirklich mit Recht? Ich möchte es bezweifeln. Sehen wir uns die beiden Texte etwas näher an, die als Kronzeugen für das "bürgerliche" Ideal dieses Christentums gelten: 1 Tim 2,1-2 und Tit 2,12. In 1 Tim 2,1-2 lesen wir:

Ich ermahne euch vor allen Dingen, Bitten, Gebete, Fürbitten und Danksagungen zu verrichten für alle Menschen, für Könige und alle Hochgestellten, damit wir ein stilles und ruhiges Leben führen können in aller Frömmigkeit und Ehrbarkeit (ἵνα ἡρεμον καὶ ἡσύχιον βίον διάγωμεν ἐν πάσῃ εὐσεβείᾳ καὶ σεμνότητι).

Es sind drei Elemente, die in diesem Satz als typische Kennzeichen "bürgerlichen" Christentums gelten: 1. das Gebet für die heidnische Obrigkeit, 2. der Wunsch nach einem "stillen und ruhigen" Leben und 3. die Haupttugenden dieses Lebens: "Frömmigkeit" (εὐσέβεια) und "Ehrbarkeit, Würde" (σεμνότης).

Wir beginnen am besten mit der εὐσέβεια. Dieses Wort kommt in den echten Paulusbriefen gar nicht vor, in den Pastoralbriefen dagegen ganze zehnmal. Es ist ein Grundbegriff der griechisch-hellenistischen Religion. "Der Stamm σεβ- bedeutet ursprünglich 'zurückweichen vor'"⁽²³⁾. Demnach meint εὐσέβεια im religiösen Sinn "die rechte Scheu vor den Göttern" oder "Gottesfurcht". Plutarch definiert sie in seiner Abhandlung über den Aberglauben in gut aristotelischer Manier als Mittel zwischen der ἀθεότης, der Gottlosigkeit, und der δεισιδαιμονία, der abergläubischen Furcht vor Göttern und Dämonen⁽²⁴⁾. Ihm kommt es bei der Frömmigkeit wie den griechischen Tragikern und Philosophen vor allem auf die innere Haltung und Gesinnung an⁽²⁵⁾. Für den landläufigen Begriff

⁽²²⁾ A. WIKENHAUSER-J. SCHMID, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament* (Freiburg 1973) 527.

⁽²³⁾ W. FÖRSTER, "σέβομαι κτλ", *TWNT* VII, 168-195, hier: 169.

⁽²⁴⁾ Plut superst 171 F. Diese Definition geht wahrscheinlich auf Theophrasts Schrift über die Frömmigkeit zurück: W. PÖTSCHER, *Theophrastos περὶ εὐσεβείας* (Philosophia Antiqua 11; Leiden 1964) 127-128.

⁽²⁵⁾ Plut superst 166 B. Was zu den beiden Fehlhaltungen führt, sind ἀμαθία καὶ ἄγνοια περὶ θεῶν "Unkenntnis und Unwissenheit betreffs der Götter" (Plut superst 164 E).

der εὐσέβεια aber gilt dies nicht, ja wir müssen, wie Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff schreibt, "von dem Moralischen, überhaupt von der subjektiven Frömmigkeit bei dem εὐσεβής absehen, wenn wir seine eigentliche Bedeutung suchen" (26). Die εὐσέβεια ist die δικαιοσύνη πρὸς θεούς und die θεραπεία τῶν θεῶν, also der "Gottesdienst", der den Göttern die ihnen zustehenden Ehren erweist, vor allem durch die Teilnahme an den vorgeschriebenen Opfern und Riten (27). Dieser "Gottesdienst" war eine Angelegenheit der Bürgergemeinde bzw. des Staates, die Teilnahme Pflicht. Das gilt auch für den späteren Kaiserkult, der die Christen in so schwere Konflikte brachte. Und dies, obwohl auch von ihnen wie, von jedem Bürger nichts weiter gefordert wurde als die Ehrenbezeugung durch den Vollzug der kultischen Handlung; der persönliche Glaube "blieb dabei vollkommen frei, aber die εὐσέβεια gegenüber den anerkannten Göttern des Staates war unverbrüchliche Bürgerpflicht. Daran hat keine Zeit gerüttelt" (28). Als ein Zeichen "christlicher Bürgerlichkeit" in den Pastoralbriefen könnte das Wort εὐσέβεια nur dann gelten, wenn es dort in diesem Sinn der "unverbrüchlichen Bürgerpflicht" verstanden würde. Aber das will wohl niemand behaupten. Was bedeutet also εὐσέβεια in den Pastoralbriefen?

Daß mit εὐσέβεια ein äußeres Verhalten gemeint ist, zeigt der Vergleich mit den gymnastischen Übungen in 1 Tim 4,7-8, wo es heißt: "γύμναζε, übe dich in der Frömmigkeit! Denn die körperliche Übung (σωματική γυμνασία) taugt zu wenig, die Frömmigkeit dagegen taugt zu allem, denn sie hat die Verheißung des Lebens, des jetzigen und des zukünftigen". Unmöglich könnte man von der πίστις sagen, man solle sich in ihr üben wie man Fitnesstraining macht; aber im Blick auf die εὐσέβεια ist diese Aufforderung sinnvoll. Und wenn in 2 Tim 3,5 den Häretikern vorgeworfen wird, sie hätten nur "die äußere Form der Frömmigkeit" (μόρφωσις εὐσεβείας), versagten sich aber deren innerer Kraft (δύναμις), so geht auch daraus hervor, daß die εὐσέβεια sich im äußeren Verhalten und in der Lebensführung zeigt.

(26) U. VON WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF, *Der Glaube der Hellenen*, 2 Bde. (Basel 31959) I, 15.

(27) Vgl. VON WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF, *Glaube*, I, 15-16; FÖRSTER, "σέβουμαι", 176-177. Förster betont zu sehr die innere Haltung.

(28) VON WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF, *Glaube*, I, 35.

Dieser Vorwurf beweist aber zugleich, daß es nach den Pastoralbriefen auf das äußere Verhalten allein gerade nicht ankommt, sondern auf die innere Kraft und den Gehalt der Frömmigkeit. Und von dieser inhaltlichen Seite redet 1 Tim 3,16. Dort wird als "Geheimnis der Frömmigkeit" (μυστήριον τῆς εὐσεβείας) ein Teil eines Christushymnus zitiert: "Der offenbar wurde im Fleisch, gerechtfertigt im Geist, der erschienen ist den Engeln, verkündigt wurde unter den Völkern, Glauben fand in der Welt und aufgenommen wurde in Herrlichkeit". Dieses so umschriebene "Geheimnis der Frömmigkeit" ist aber kein anderes als das kurz zuvor in V.9 erwähnte "Geheimnis des Glaubens" (μυστήριον τῆς πίστεως). εὐσέβεια und πίστις sind also in *inhaltlicher* Hinsicht vollkommene Synonyme. Sie unterscheiden sich nur insofern, als εὐσέβεια eben auch das aus der inneren Haltung erwachsende äußere Verhalten bezeichnen kann. Und um dieses Vorteils willen hat der Verfasser der Pastoralbriefe dieses Wort wohl auch aus der religiösen Sprache des Hellenismus übernommen und mit christlichem Gehalt gefüllt⁽²⁹⁾. So schließt der Begriff der εὐσέβεια, wie ihn die Pastoralbriefe fassen, den der πίστις mit ein. Mit einer "Hellenisierung des Christentums" hat dies so wenig zu tun wie mit einer "christlichen Bürgerlichkeit".

Was nun die Aufforderung zum Gebet für die Obrigkeit betrifft, so hat diese in den Pastoralbriefen nichts Auffälliges an sich. Sie ist nur die Konsequenz aus der Einstellung, die Paulus in Römer 13 einschärft:

Jede Seele soll sich den übergeordneten staatlichen Gewalten unterordnen. Denn es gibt keine staatliche Gewalt, die nicht von Gott ist, und die bestehenden sind von Gott eingesetzt. Wer sich daher der staatlichen Gewalt widersetzt, widersetzt sich der Anordnung Gottes. Die Widersetzlichen aber werden sich selbst das Strafgericht zuziehen (Röm 13,1-2).

Das Gebet für diese Obrigkeit dürfte sich von selbst verstehen. Und ein Zeichen für "Bürgerlichkeit" im Sinn eines angepaßten, mittelmäßigen Durchschnittschristentums wird man darin kaum erblicken können. Denn einen Gewissenskonflikt brachte das Gebet für die Obrigkeit im Gottesdienst für Christen so wenig mit sich wie für Ju-

⁽²⁹⁾ Vgl. H. VON LIPS, *Glaube – Gemeinde – Amt*. Zum Verständnis der Ordination in den Pastoralbriefen (FRLANT 122; Göttingen 1979) 80-87.

den; ein solcher trat erst auf, wenn es darum ging, Gott mehr zu gehorchen als den Menschen (Apg 5,29). Das Christentum hatte also keineswegs "allen Grund, staatsfeindlich zu sein", wie Dibelius schreibt⁽³⁰⁾. Und gerade *weil* die Christen den geforderten Kaiserkult als mit ihrem Gewissen unvereinbar im allgemeinen verweigerten, mußten sie ihre Loyalität und εὐσέβεια der rechtmäßigen Obrigkeit gegenüber durch ihr Gebet für sie beweisen⁽³¹⁾.

Damit kommen wir zum dritten angeblich "bürgerlichen" Element in 1 Tim 2,1-2, dem Wunsch, aufgrund der Gebete für alle Menschen und insbesondere für alle Hochgestellten "ein stilles und ruhiges Leben führen zu können in aller Frömmigkeit und Ehrbarkeit". Ein Satz wie dieser, schreibt Wolfgang Schrage, sei "denn doch ein Unikum im Neuen Testament" und verdeutliche die "statische Bürgerlichkeit" der Pastoralbriefe⁽³²⁾. Martin Dibelius und Norbert Brox verweisen zum Kontrast dazu auf 2 Kor 11,23-33, die berühmte Aufzählung, die Paulus von seinen Mühen, Leiden und Gefahren bei der Verkündigung des Evangeliums gibt⁽³³⁾. Aber man sollte grundsätzlich nur Vergleichbares vergleichen. 1 Tim 2,1-2 schildert ein Ideal christlichen Lebens, 2 Kor 11,23-33 ist ein Erlebnisbericht. Wenn man schon vergleichen will, dann muß man diesen Erlebnisbericht mit den entsprechenden Aussagen im 2. Timotheusbrief vergleichen, der die Thematik des apostolischen Leidens mehrfach aufnimmt.

Der Wunsch nach einem "stillen und ruhigen Leben" darf also keinesfalls mit dem "kampffreien Dasein des Paulus" kontrastiert werden. Und er erinnert zunächst auch gar nicht an die Ruhe als die erste Bürgerpflicht, sondern vielmehr an die durchaus nicht bürgerlich motivierte Sehnsucht der Stoiker nach einem Leben "in Stille und Seelenruhe" (ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ καὶ ἀταραξίᾳ) (Epikt I 10,2), kurz: nach der εὖποια βίου, einem Leben, das ruhig dahinfließt wie ein gewaltiger Strom⁽³⁴⁾.

⁽³⁰⁾ DIBELIUS-CONZELMANN, *Pastoralbriefe*, 30.

⁽³¹⁾ Das bei DIBELIUS-CONZELMANN, *Pastoralbriefe*, 30 vorgebrachte Argument muß also gerade umgekehrt werden. Vgl. SPICQ, *Épîtres pastorales*, I, 359f.

⁽³²⁾ SCHRAGE, *Ethik*, 267.

⁽³³⁾ DIBELIUS-CONZELMANN, *Pastoralbriefe*, 32; BROX, *Pastoralbriefe*, 124.

⁽³⁴⁾ Vgl. Epikt I 4,27: εὐρῶς καὶ ἀταράχως βιοῦσθαι. SPICQ, *Épîtres pastorales*, I, 361f. Zur stoischen Definition der εὐδαιμονία als der εὖποια βίου s. J. v. ARNIM, *Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta*, 4 Bde (Leipzig 1903-1924) Index s. v.

Die traditionsgeschichtliche Quelle dieses Ideals in den Pastoralbriefen ist jedoch nicht der Stoizismus, sondern Paulus. Dieser schreibt an die Thessalonicher, es müsse ihr Ehrgeiz sein, Ruhe zu halten (ἡσυχάζειν), sich um die eigenen Geschäfte zu kümmern (πράσσειν τὰ ἴδια) und mit ihren eigenen Händen zu arbeiten, "wie wir euch geboten haben". Paulus erinnert hier also an seine mündliche Unterweisung und schließt dann mit der Begründung: "..., damit ihr euch anständig (εὐσχημόνως) verhaltet denen draußen gegenüber und auf niemanden angewiesen seid" (1 Thess 4,11-12). "Mit ἡσυχάζειν ist hier das ruhige bürgerliche Leben gemeint", schreibt Dibelius lapidar⁽³⁵⁾. Aber nicht nur das Motiv des *ruhigen* Lebens finden wir in dieser Stelle, sondern auch das des *ehrbaren*. Denn was Paulus hier und öfter mit dem εὐσχημόνως περιπατεῖν, dem anständigen Leben meint, ist genau dasselbe, was der Verfasser der Pastoralbriefe als σεμνότης "Ehrbarkeit, Würde" bezeichnet. εὐσχημοσύνη und σεμνότης sind Synonyme⁽³⁶⁾. Dabei liegt aber weder Paulus noch dem Verfasser der Pastoralbriefe an der bürgerlichen Tugend um ihrer selbst willen, wie die Begründung dafür beweist: die Heiden sollen keinen Anlaß finden, Leben und Lehre der Christen zu verleumden; "..., damit das Wort Gottes nicht gelästert wird" (Tit 2,5). In 1 Thess 4,12 ist dieser Grund durch das πρὸς τοὺς ἕξω angedeutet⁽³⁷⁾.

Weder ist also der Satz 1 Tim 2,1-2 ein solches "Unikum" im Neuen Testament, wie Wolfgang Schrage meint, noch ist das Motiv des ehrbaren Lebens und der Rücksicht auf die Gegner ein "typisches Motiv der 'christlichen Bürgerlichkeit'"⁽³⁸⁾. Der Verfasser der Pastoralbriefe hat hier eine paulinische Tradition aufgenommen und entfaltet, die nach dem ausdrücklichen Zeugnis des Paulus selbst zu seiner mündlichen Predigt gehört hatte, zu jenen Anweisungen, die er den Thessalonichern "im Namen des Herrn Jesus" gegeben hatte (1 Thess 4,2).

⁽³⁵⁾ M. DIBELIUS, *An die Thessalonicher I II. An die Philipper* (HNT 11; Tübingen 1937) 23.

⁽³⁶⁾ Vgl. SPICQ, *Épîtres pastorales*, I, 362, 406-409.

⁽³⁷⁾ Vgl. 1 Kor 10,32-33; 1 Tim 6,1. W. C. VAN UNNIK, "Die Rücksicht auf die Reaktion der Nicht-Christen als Motiv in der altchristlichen Paränese", *Judentum – Urchristentum – Kirche* (FS J. Jeremias; [Hrsg. W. ELTESTER] BZNW 26; Berlin 1964) 221-234, hier: 227-230.

⁽³⁸⁾ DIBELIUS-CONZELMANN, *Pastoralbriefe*, 106. Letzteres ist das Ergebnis der gründlichen Studie von VAN UNNIK, "Rücksicht", 233-234.

IV

Kommen wir also nun zum zweiten Kronzeugen einer "christlichen Bürgerlichkeit" in den Pastoralbriefen: Tit 2,12. Dort wird der Wunsch geäußert, "selbstbeherrscht und gerecht und fromm" zu leben in der jetzigen Welt, σωφρόνως καὶ δικαίως καὶ εὐσεβῶς. Das sind drei der vier Kardinaltugenden der griechischen Ethik⁽³⁹⁾. So charakterisiert Aischylos in seinen "Sieben gegen Theben" den Seher Amphiaraos als einen Mann, "selbstbeherrscht, gerecht, tapfer und fromm" (σώφρων δίκαιος ἀγαθὸς εὐσεβὴς ἀνὴρ) (610), im Gegensatz zu den "Unfrommen" (δυσσεβεῖς) (598) und denen, "die an die Götter nicht denken" (θεῶν ἀμνήμονες) (606). Daß wir dennoch diese Tugenden in den Pastoralbriefen nicht ohne weiteres im griechisch-hellenistischen Sinn verstehen dürfen, haben wir bereits am Beispiel der εὐσέβεια gesehen. Durch die Einfügung in das Ganze des christlichen Glaubens haben die griechischen Tugenden nicht nur ihren Ort verändert, sondern auch ihre Wesensart. Hier wird nicht das Christentum der hellenistischen Ethik, sondern vielmehr diese dem Christentum angepaßt⁽⁴⁰⁾.

Das wird noch deutlicher, wenn wir den Zusammenhang betrachten, in dem unsere Stelle steht. Der zitierte Ausschnitt entstammt nämlich einem längeren Satz, der in V. 11 beginnt und erst mit V. 14 endet. Er lautet vollständig:

Denn erschienen ist die Gnade Gottes, heilbringend für alle Menschen, und sie erzieht uns dazu, daß wir der Gottlosigkeit und den weltlichen Begierden absagen, um so selbstbeherrscht und gerecht

⁽³⁹⁾ Nach S. Ch. MOTT, "Greek Ethics and Christian Conversion. The Philonic Background of Titus II 10-14 and III 3-7", *NT* 20 (1978) 22-48, hier: 24, hat erst Platon im Kanon der vier Kardinaltugenden die "Frömmigkeit" (δσιότης/εὐσέβεια) durch die "Klugheit" (φρόνησις) ersetzt. Mott will mit vielen Parallelen zeigen, daß Tit 2,10-14 und 3,3-7 von Traditionen abhängig ist, die vor allem durch Philo, aber auch Weish und 4 Makk repräsentiert seien ("Greek Ethics", 47). Der Einfluß des hellenistischen Judentums ist wohl richtig gesehen, eine besondere Abhängigkeit von Philo m.E. jedoch unwahrscheinlich.

⁽⁴⁰⁾ Gegen die Rede von der "Anpassung" oder "Angleichung", die man z.B. findet bei SCHNACKENBURG, *Sittliche Botschaft*, 103; M. WOLTER, *Die Pastoralbriefe als Paulustradition* (FRLANT 146; Göttingen 1988) 255 und ROLOFF, *Timotheus*, 384. SCHRAGE, *Ethik*, 265 schreibt in Auseinandersetzung mit R. Schwarz von einer "gewissen Weltanpassung und Sterilität" der Pastoralbriefe als dem zwangsläufigen Ergebnis ihrer "biederen 'Schlichtheit'". Vgl. auch SCHRAGE, *Ethik*, 270: "Anpassung an das Normale".

und fromm leben zu können in der jetzigen Welt, in der Erwartung der seligen Hoffnung und der Erscheinung der Herrlichkeit unseres großen Gottes und Heilands Jesus Christus, der sich für uns hingegeben hat, um uns loszukaufen von aller Gesetzlosigkeit und sich ein ihm gehöriges Volk zu reinigen, das eifert nach guten Werken.

Als erstes bemerken wir, daß die Ethik der Kardinaltugenden hier mit der wenig bürgerlich anmutenden Absage an die weltlichen Begierden verbunden ist, ja diese Absage erscheint geradezu als Voraussetzung der Tugendethik⁽⁴¹⁾.

Noch bezeichnender aber ist deren doppelte Begründung und Einbettung: einmal in der Inkarnation und einmal in der Eschatologie. Es ist die in Christus erschienene Gnade Gottes, die zum tugendhaften Leben "erzieht": "La grâce apprend à vivre"⁽⁴²⁾. Dieser Gedanke der χάρις παιδεύουσα, der menschengewordenen Gnade Gottes als Erzieherin, gehört zu den wirklich originellen Gedanken unseres Autors. Diese Erziehung durch die Gnade und die oben erwähnte Einübung in die Frömmigkeit (1 Tim 4,7) bilden zwei Seiten eines Vorgangs. Und das so geformte Leben wird geführt in der Erwartung der Parusie Christi, die in den Pastoralbriefen als ἐπιφάνεια, als "Erscheinung" Christi bezeichnet wird.

Auch der zweite Kronzeuge beweist also weder eine "Hellenisierung des Christentums" noch ein "bürgerliches" Ideal, sondern vielmehr die Assimilationskraft einer lebendigen Idee, wie sie John Henry Newman in seinem berühmten "Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine" beschrieben hat.

V

Hier muß noch ein Wort zur Eschatologie der Pastoralbriefe hinzugefügt werden⁽⁴³⁾. Man pflegt diese Eschatologie mit der des Paulus zu vergleichen und stellt dabei fest, daß in ihr "das paulini-

⁽⁴¹⁾ Man beachte die Hypotaxe: ἀρνησάμενοι... ζήσωμεν in V. 12! SPICQ, *Épîtres pastorales*, II, 638 schreibt im übrigen zu Recht: "Le participe aoriste exprime une rupture décidée avec le passé".

⁽⁴²⁾ SPICQ, *Épîtres pastorales*, II, 635. Übrigens haben wir hier, abgesehen von Apg 7,22; 22,3, den einzigen Fall im NT, wo παιδεύω die klassische griechische Bedeutung "erziehen, unterweisen" hat. Leider wird dieser Sachverhalt durch die eigentümliche Gliederung dieses Lemmas in Bauers Wörterbuch s.v. verdeckt. Entsprechend ist παιδεία einzig in 2 Tim 3,16 im Sinn von "Erziehung" und nicht wie an den anderen Stellen im NT von "Zucht" oder "Züchtigung" zu verstehen (Eph 6,4; Hebr 12,5-11).

⁽⁴³⁾ Vgl. dazu TOWNER, *Goal*, 61-74.

sche Verständnis des eschatologischen Charakters der Gegenwart" doch "stark verblaßt" sei, "und von der Spannung zwischen Gegenwart und Zukunft wie von der Sehnsucht auf die Vollendung" nichts mehr zu spüren⁽⁴⁴⁾. Darum wird sie meistens recht abschätzig beurteilt. Zu Unrecht. Freilich ist von der Spannung zwischen Schon und Noch nicht der eschatologischen Vollendung und von einer Naherwartung in den Pastoralbriefen nichts mehr zu spüren. Der Begriff des Reiches Gottes, das im Kommen begriffen ist (Mk 1,15), ist zum "himmlischen Reich" geworden, in das hinein "Paulus" auch durch den Tod hindurch von Christus gerettet zu werden hofft (2 Tim 4,18). Damit ist das Reich Gottes nicht mehr als dynamische Größe im Rahmen der geschichtlichen Eschatologie begriffen, sondern als gleichsam statisch bestehende Größe im Rahmen der Jenseitseschatologie⁽⁴⁵⁾. Was die Pastoralbriefe aber bewahrt haben, ist die lebendige Vergegenwärtigung der Letzten Dinge, des eschatologischen Heils wie des Gerichts. Und allein darauf kommt es letztlich an⁽⁴⁶⁾. Und in welchem Maß die Vergegenwärtigung der Letzten Dinge das Denken der Pastoralbriefe prägt, kommt etwa in 2 Tim 4,1 zum Ausdruck, wo eine dringende Mahnung eingeleitet wird mit den Worten: "Ich beschwöre dich vor Gott und Christus Jesus, der einmal richten wird über Lebende und Tote, bei seiner Erscheinung und bei seinem Reich...". Die eschatologische Ausrichtung der Gegenwart kommt in diesen Briefen aber nirgends eindrucksvoller zur Sprache als in dem Teil eines Christushymnus in 2 Tim 2,11-13:

Denn wenn wir mitgestorben sind, werden wir auch mitleben; wenn wir ausharren, werden wir auch mitherrschen; wenn wir verleugnen, wird auch er uns verleugnen; wenn wir untreu sind, er bleibt treu, denn sich selbst verleugnen kann er nicht.

⁽⁴⁴⁾ BULTMANN, *Theologie*, 468.

⁽⁴⁵⁾ Zu den Begriffen "geschichtliche Eschatologie" und "Jenseitseschatologie", s. M. REISER, *Die Gerichtspredigt Jesu*. Eine Untersuchung zur eschatologischen Verkündigung Jesu und ihrem frühjüdischen Hintergrund (NTAbh NF 23; Münster 1990) 3-5, 133-134, 141-144. Hier sei nur noch darauf hingewiesen, daß im Frühjudentum zwar das geschichtliche Modell der Eschatologie ohne das der Jenseitseschatologie begegnet, niemals aber das Modell der Jenseitseschatologie losgelöst von dem der geschichtlichen. Das trifft auch bei den Pastoralbriefen zu.

⁽⁴⁶⁾ Diese lebendige Vergegenwärtigung der Letzten Dinge geht der heutigen Theologie und Verkündigung fast vollständig ab! Sie ist in dieser Hinsicht weit "bürgerlicher" als die der Pastoralbriefe.

Hier ist nicht nur deutlich der paulinische Gedanke des Mitsterbens aufgenommen, das zum Mitleben führt (Röm 6,8), sondern auch ein bezeichnendes Gerichtswort Jesu: "Jeder, der sich zu mir bekennt vor den Menschen, zu dem wird sich auch der Menschensohn bekennen vor den Engeln Gottes. Wer aber mich verleugnet vor den Menschen, der wird auch verleugnet werden vor den Engeln Gottes" ⁽⁴⁷⁾.

Es kann also keine Rede davon sein, daß die Eschatologie in den Pastoralbriefen "als kritische und inspirierende Kraft außer Sicht geraten" ⁽⁴⁸⁾ sei, und bei aller Einrichtung in der Welt ist die Distanz zu ihr nicht aufzugeben. Wir finden in diesen Briefen nicht nur den Wunsch, selbstbeherrscht, gerecht und fromm zu leben "in der jetzigen Welt", sondern auch den warnenden Hinweis, daß Demas Paulus aus Liebe zu eben dieser jetzigen Welt verlassen hat (2 Tim 4,10) ⁽⁴⁹⁾.

VI

Der Gedanke des ungescheuten Bekenntnisses paßt ebenso wenig zu einem bürgerlichen Christentum wie der Gedanke des Leidens um des Evangeliums willen, der in dem eben zitierten Hymnus anklingt. Das Thema des Leidens des Apostels hat der Verfasser in den vorhergehenden Versen entwickelt. Wie Gerhard Lohfink gezeigt hat, ist dieses Thema in der gesamten paulinischen Tradition nirgends so betont und umfassend aufgenommen worden wie im 2. Timotheusbrief:

In das Amtsdenken der Pastoralbriefe ist so durch den 2. Timotheusbrief ein personales Element integriert, das deutlich ein Gegengewicht gegen alles Amtliche und Institutionelle bildet. Denn Leiden ist etwas zutiefst Persönliches, nicht verwaltbar und nicht institutionalisierbar. Institutionen sind bekanntlich leidensunfähig ⁽⁵⁰⁾.

⁽⁴⁷⁾ Lk 12,8-9 par Mt 10,32-33. Vgl. Mk 8,38/Lk 9,26.

⁽⁴⁸⁾ SCHRAGE, *Ethik*, 269-270.

⁽⁴⁹⁾ Vgl. KIDD, *Wealth*, 181-194.

⁽⁵⁰⁾ G. LOHFINK, "Paulinische Theologie in der Rezeption der Pastoralbriefe", *Paulus in den neutestamentlichen Spätschriften* (Hrsg. K. KERTELGE) (Quaestiones Disputatae 89; Freiburg 1981) 70-121, hier: 93. Von einer "moralischen Anstalt" ist diese Kirche weit entfernt (gegen SCHRAGE, *Ethik*, 269).

Verfolgung und Martyrium sind in den Pastoralbriefen auch nicht nur für die Apostel und ihre Mitarbeiter bestimmt, wie Josef Schmid und Norbert Brox schreiben⁽⁵¹⁾. Das "Wir" des Christushymnus mein auch im Sinn des Verfassers des 2. Timotheusbriefes alle Christen. Es scheint mir undenkbar, daß dieser die Aussagen des Hymnus "auf die Situation des Predigers" deutet, "obwohl sie ursprünglich nicht speziell gemeint sind"⁽⁵²⁾. In 2 Tim 3,12 heißt es ausdrücklich: "Alle, die fromm leben wollen in Christus Jesus, werden verfolgt werden". Gerade weil dieser Satz den Charakter einer Sentenz hat, darf man ihn vielleicht auch umkehren und sagen: Wer also nicht verfolgt wird, führt offensichtlich kein frommes Leben in Christus Jesus.

VII

Ich möchte zu einem Resümee kommen und dabei ausgehen von der Feststellung, mit der Wolfgang Schrage sein Kapitel über die Ethik der Pastoralbriefe beginnt:

Die Pastoralbriefe sind viel weniger das Dokument einer kongenialen Schülerschaft des Paulus als Kol. und Eph. Hier ist alles viel prosaischer, hausbackener, bürgerlicher, moralischer, auch traditioneller und formelhafter, vor allem aber kirchenamtlicher und institutioneller⁽⁵³⁾.

Die hier aufgezählten Attribute sind zutreffend bis auf drei. Wohl ist in den Pastoralbriefen vieles nüchterner, prosaischer, traditioneller und formelhafter, kirchenamtlicher und institutioneller als in den echten Paulusbriefen oder in den genannten Deutero-Paulinen, aber nicht "hausbackener", "moralischer" oder "bürgerlicher". Jedenfalls nicht, wenn man unter "bürgerlichem Christentum" ein an die Normen der heidnischen Gesellschaft angepaßtes und verglichen mit dem paulinischen Ideal gemäßigtes und irgendwie laues Christentum versteht⁽⁵⁴⁾. Freilich, der Verfasser der Pastoralbriefe ist

⁽⁵¹⁾ BROX, *Pastoralbriefe*, 124; WIKENHAUSER-SCHMID, *Einleitung*, 527.

⁽⁵²⁾ BROX, *Pastoralbriefe*, 244.

⁽⁵³⁾ SCHRAGE, *Ethik*, 263.

⁽⁵⁴⁾ Vgl. das differenzierte Urteil bei P. LAMPE-U. LUZ, "Nachpaulinisches Christentum und pagane Gesellschaft", *Die Anfänge des Christentums*. Alte Welt und neue Hoffnung (Stuttgart 1987) 185-216, hier: 211. Aber sollte man auf einen so mißverständlichen und nur sehr eingeschränkt anwendbaren Ausdruck nicht lieber ganz verzichten?

kein Paulus; er verfügt weder über das Temperament des Paulus noch über dessen hinreißende Gewalt der Sprache oder die Fülle und Tiefe seiner Gedanken. Darum suchen wir bei ihm auch vergeblich ein Hohes Lied der Liebe, ein Wort über die Macht der Sünde, das Leben aus dem Geist oder die Versöhnung des Kosmos in Jesus Christus. Aber er verweist auf Paulus und macht ihn, nicht sich selbst, zum Zeugen des Evangeliums schlechthin⁽⁵⁵⁾. Und vielleicht verdanken wir ihm mehr als wir wissen auch den echten Paulus.

Die Pastoralbriefe spiegeln eine fortgeschrittene Zeit und eine gewandelte Situation der Kirche wider. Ihre Theologie ist der Versuch, dieser gewandelten Situation unter Berufung auf Paulus gerecht zu werden, und stellt trotz allen Akzentverschiebungen gegenüber der paulinischen Theologie eine notwendige und legitime Entwicklung der christlichen Lehre dar. Die gewandelte Situation der Kirche und die notwendige Abwehr einer gnostischen Irrlehre erklärt manche Besonderheiten dieser Briefe, vor allem ihre Betonung der Ämter. Diese Feststellungen sind nicht neu; aber sie erschienen bisher allzusehr als Ehrenrettung der vermeintlichen "Bürgerlichkeit" dieser Briefe⁽⁵⁶⁾. Es war die Ehrenrettung eines falschen Etiketts für richtige Beobachtungen. Und mag auch das Christentum der Pastoralbriefe in mancher Hinsicht als "ein etwas verblaßter Paulinismus" erscheinen⁽⁵⁷⁾, in mancher Hinsicht ist es auch ein verstärkter Paulinismus. Ja, manchmal bieten die Pastoralbriefe gerade dort, wo man es am wenigsten vermutet hätte, nur die Entfaltung von Gedanken und Tendenzen, die bei Paulus selbst beginnen. "Gott ist nicht ein Gott der Unordnung, sondern des Friedens". "Alles soll in Anstand und Ordnung geschehen": Diese Sätze stehen nicht in den Pastoralbriefen, sondern in 1 Kor 14,33.40⁽⁵⁸⁾. Schon

⁽⁵⁵⁾ Vgl. LOHFINK, "Paulinische Theologie"; E. DASSMANN, *Der Stachel im Fleisch*. Paulus in der frühchristlichen Literatur bis Irenäus (Münster 1979) 18, 165-173.

⁽⁵⁶⁾ Vgl. z.B. DIBELIUS-CONZELMANN, *Pastoralbriefe*, 33; BROX, *Pastoralbriefe*, 124-125; W.G. KÜMMEL, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament* (Heidelberg 191978) 338-339; VIELHAUER, *Geschichte*, 233-234; H. KÖSTER, *Einführung in das Neue Testament im Rahmen der Religionsgeschichte und Kulturgeschichte der hellenistischen und römischen Zeit* (Berlin 1980) 744.

⁽⁵⁷⁾ BULTMANN, *Theologie*, 536.

⁽⁵⁸⁾ Vgl. 2 Kor 12,20 (ἀκαταστασία im Lasterkatalog). Hier sei auch nicht vergessen, daß Paulus durchaus autoritär anordnen und auftreten konnte: 1 Kor 4,21; 11,16.34. In 1 Thess 4,2 spricht er von den παραγγελίαι, den Anweisungen, die er im Namen des Herrn Jesu gegeben habe. KIDD,

die Thessalonicher hatte Paulus zur Zurechtweisung der ἄτακτοι ermahnt (1 Thess 5,14), "die ohne und gegen die Ordnung leben" ⁽⁵⁹⁾. Und in Phil 4,8 steht ein Satz, den man geradezu als das ethische Programm der Pastoralbriefe bezeichnen könnte: "Im übrigen, Brüder, was immer wahr, was ehrbar, was gerecht, was rein, was liebenswert ist und gern gesehen, was irgend Tugend ist und Lob einträgt, darauf seid bedacht". Besser kann man das ethische Ideal der Pastoralbriefe nicht umschreiben.

Johannes Gutenberg – Universität Mainz
 Saarstrasse 21
 D-6500 Mainz

Marius REISER

SOMMAIRE

Beaucoup d'exégètes estiment que l'éthique chrétienne des épîtres pastorales trahit les convictions religieuses de Paul pour glisser vers une adaptation à l'éthique hellénistique du « bon citoyen ». Cet article affirme au contraire que ces épîtres sont enracinées dans la pensée paulinienne authentique et redéfinissent en conformité avec celle-ci tous les concepts qui ont pu être empruntés au monde non-chrétien dans lequel vivaient leurs destinataires.

Wealth, 195 spricht von seinem "growing sense that on the matter of 'bourgeois' Christianity there is more that unites the Pastorals and Paul than there is that divides them".

⁽⁵⁹⁾ T. HOLTZ, *Der erste Brief an die Thessalonicher* (EKKNT 13); Zürich 1986) 252.

The Return of the Unclean Spirit (Luke 11,24-26)

On a certain occasion Jesus cast out a demon (Luke 11,14); his action was interpreted by some (11,15) to mean that his power to exorcise was given him by Beelzebul. Among the points of Jesus's response (11,17-26) to this interpretation is the story of a demon who returns with seven other, worse demons to repossess a human being.

By far, the ordinary explanation of the story of the repossessed man is that a person will likely suffer a second possession by a demon if he does not replace the former possessing demon with faith in Jesus (God)⁽¹⁾. The key to this interpretation of vv. 24-26 is in the understanding of the participles which describe the man freed

⁽¹⁾ For example, cf. G. HAHN, *Das Evangelium nach Lucas*, Vol. 2 (Breslau 1894) 116, who, after citing other interpretations of Luke 11,24-26, concludes that this short story means to show "wie das bloss neutrale Verhalten sehr wohl in ein feindliches Übergehen könne"; A. LOISY, *L'Évangile selon Luc* (Paris 1924) 324, interprets the story to mean "que quiconque n'est pas avec Jésus par une foi sincère et persévérante ne gagne rien à chasser les démons ou à être délivré provisoirement de leur joug"; J. JEREMIAS, *Die Gleichnisse Jesu* (Göttingen 1962) 196, who, in commenting directly on Matt 12,43-45, seems to be addressing Luke 11,24-26 as well: "Überleg Dir's reiflich! Denn: ein halber Anfang ist schlimmer als gar kein Anfang. Diese Warnung spricht das Gleichnis vom zurückkehrenden unrein Geist aus"; O. DA SPINETOLI, *Luca* (Assisi 1982) 404: "Luca si preoccupa delle battaglie di Gesù con gli spiriti maligni e con i suoi avversari, ma contemporaneamente guarda alle file della sua chiesa dove non mancano spiriti vacillanti, pronti a tornare al vecchio padrone che hanno rifiutato nel battesimo per passare a Cristo. Il testo che conclude il dibattito sui poteri di Gesù (vv. 24-26) è ricordato con questa trepidazione pastorale"; E. LAVERDIERE, *Luke* (Dublin 1984) 163; C. TALBERT, *Reading Luke* (New York 1986) 138: "It is not adequate, however, to cast out a demon if there is no acceptance of the kingdom of God whose power is attested by its expulsion (vss. 24-26). Only God's rule of human life prevents the return of demonic activity..."; L. SABOURIN, *L'Évangile de Luc* (Rome 1985) 236: "Le texte de Luc semble considérer des cas individuels: laisser revenir le démon expulsé, c'est s'exposer a une situation pire, car l'esprit mauvais aura remporté une victoire. Pour empêcher son retour la personne libérée doit s'enrôler fermement dans le camp opposé en adhérant à Jésus et à

from a first possession: *sesarōmenon kai kekosmēmenon* (v. 25). That is to say, Jesus, by exorcism, has *cleansed* and *put a man in order* ⁽²⁾; if the man does not then “repent and believe”, he is very liable to be repossessed. In this interpretation the story ⁽³⁾ reveals its imports as “moral” and it becomes a subtle exhortation to faith for those who have experienced the wonderful effects of exorcism (and for all readers of the Gospel). In short, miracle becomes a call to faith, to commitment ⁽⁴⁾.

l'Évangile”; J. FITZMYER, *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV* (AB 28a; Garden City, NY 1985) 924-925: “In the Lucan context, the episode seems to mean that it is not sufficient that a demon be driven out; the person represented by the house swept clean and set in order must be on Jesus’ side... and also listen to the word of God and observe it...; so E. KLOSTERMANN, *Lukasevangelium*, 127. ... In any case, the episode adds a caution to that expressed in v. 23. The house must not remain merely in a state of readiness for reception; it must be filled with the word of God”; C. F. EVANS, *Saint Luke* (London 1990) 494: “In Luke it [the story] seems to teach that exorcism is in itself negative, and is not conclusively proof against evil. Positive possession of, and by, the good is necessary, and a state of neutrality between good and evil is impossible”.

⁽²⁾ The two passive participles are, in the first instance, to be understood as describing an *oikos* (11,24); the house, of course, is then understood as a human being and the participles must be adjusted in their meaning accordingly. The second participle can be understood in two senses: “put in order” or “adorned, decorated”; cf. W. BAUER, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (tr. and 4th ed. by M. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich; Chicago 1952) s. *kosmeō*, 445.

⁽³⁾ I. H. MARSHALL, *The Gospel of Luke* (Grand Rapids 1978) 479 conveys his hesitation about the usual interpretation of Luke 11,24-26: “The unspoken point is then generally thought to be a warning against the danger of failing to prevent the re-entry of an exorcised demon by filling the empty ‘house’ with a new inhabitant. The problem is whether this point should not have been made more clearly in the saying itself”. He goes on to note: “It [the story] may be a warning to those who exorcise demons without giving a positive substitute to their patients” ... “It is not sufficient to cast out demons if there is no acceptance of the kingdom whose presence is attested by the expulsion of demons” (cf. FITZMYER, *Gospel*, 924, who cites as a possible meaning: “...cautioning Christian disciples about too great assurance over manifestations of the defeat of physical or psychic evil”). Later, however, Marshall (480) remarks again upon “the positive action the man has failed to take”, thus seemingly aligning himself with the interpretation of most exegetes.

⁽⁴⁾ Other interpretations, which stress the psychology of the man (v. 26) cleansed and put in order, are those of N. GELDENHUYS, *Com-*

I. The Negative Argument

Does the interpretation just given satisfy? There is a certain amount of disgruntlement in having to accept a negative implication for *sesarōmenon kai kekosmēmenon*. Why should these words mean not only cleansed and put in order, but also empty of Jesus (God)? Matthew (12,44), with his addition of *scholazonta*, does suggest emptiness; but we are dealing with Luke, who does not have this word⁽⁵⁾.

One might suggest that, since the man is in fact repossessed, he did not have a state of soul required to resist repossession⁽⁶⁾ — and the state of soul which could resist repossession is faith in Jesus (God). Granted that the man is repossessed, it is a leap to say this happened because he had no faith in Jesus (God). The only clear motive given for the unclean spirit's decision to repossess the man is the cleanliness and order he finds in the man, some qualities the demon evidently did not find in *anydrois topois* when searching for *anapausin*. Can we say that *sesarōmenon kai kekosmēmenon* could *absolutely* and *in no way* imply "empty of faith"? Put in absolute terms, perhaps not, but on the other hand one must admit that these words are shaky ground indeed for the interpretation built on

mentary on the Gospel of Luke (Grand Rapids 1954) 330, who refers to the exorcised as "one who desires to remain neutral ... foolish"; A. PLUMMER, *The Gospel According to Luke* (Edinburgh 1922) 304, who speaks of the man as one who "allows himself to be repossessed"; A. LEANEY, *A Commentary on the Gospel According to Luke* (London 1966) 190, who speaks of "the fate of those who do not seek the Holy Spirit". Leaney (190) points to "verse 13" ("...how much more will the heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to those who ask him", Luke 11,13) as a ground for his interpretation.

(5) Contra E. SCHWEIZER, *The Good News According to Luke* (tr. by D. Green; London 1984) 195: "Vss. 24-26 are almost identical to Matthew 12:43-45 ... and are hardly to be understood in a different sense". This sense is: "No one can remain neutral like an empty house; either the Holy Spirit (1 Cor 6:19) or an unclean spirit will dwell there". As regards the exegesis of Matthew, cf. J. MEIER, *Matthew* (Dublin 1980) 139: "When (or better, if) he finds that no positive good, no countervailing force, no Holy Spirit has taken possession in his absence, he and his associates reclaim the man as their abode".

(6) R. LENSKI, *The Interpretation of St. Luke's Gospel* (Columbus, OH 1951) 642, suggests that the one cleansed and put in order is "quiet and leading an outwardly undisturbed life, yet one that is quite apart from God".

them⁽⁷⁾. The usual interpretation of Luke 11,24-26, insofar as it rests on an understanding of *sesarōmenon kai kekosmēmenon*, is not convincing⁽⁸⁾; at the same time, the story is open to another interpretation, to arrive at which we will now present guiding observations.

Having just presented one negative argument concerning the sense of *sesarōmenon kai kekosmēmenon*, the rest of this essay will be concerned with two positive arguments. The first will be the briefer, concerned to present a consideration regarding unity of Jesus's defense speech; the second will be longer and concerned with an analysis of the story of the wandering unclean spirit.

II. First Positive Argument: One Speech, One Theme

The story of the wandering unclean spirit forms a part of a long speech which shows no interruption⁽⁹⁾. Since Jesus's speech is con-

(7) It might be suggested that the verse previous to the story about the wandering demon and the verses following it help one see that it is lack of faith in Jesus that occasions repossession. The previous verse (23) would be interpreted to mean that "anyone who is not with me is against me..." prepares for the man who, though cleansed and put in order, is without faith (or "not with me" and so "against me"). The verses subsequent to the story of the wandering demon (27-28) would be interpreted as referring back to the man repossessed, as a contradiction of "those who are blessed because they hear the word of God and keep it". To understand these initial and subsequent verses in this way supposes that lack of faith is at the root of the man's repossession — but that is precisely what is being challenged in this essay. The meaning of verses 23 and 27-28 must wait, in my opinion, upon the meaning of the wandering demon story; they do not dictate its meaning. Authors do, however, interpret Luke 11,24-26 by the already decided meaning of these verses 23 and 27-28, or at least by one of them: LOISY, *Luc*, 324-325; FITZMYER, *Luke*, 925; LAVERDIERE, *Luke*, 163; SCHWEIZER, *Good News*, 195.

(8) FITZMYER, *Luke*, 925, notes that the story "says nothing about a relapse into sin". Most forceful in his statements and quite against the general exegetical tendency of authors is M.-J. LAGRANGE, *Évangile selon Saint Luc* (Paris 1948). First he notes: "mais expulsion du démon n'est pas en soi conversion, et retour du démon ne signifie pas rechute. La possession peut atteindre un juste, et il peut en être victime plus d'une fois" (333). Then, he concludes: "il n'y a aucune allusion à une faute du possédé libéré; le reproche de n'avoir pas introduit l'Esprit-Saint n'est même pas suggéré indirectement..." (335).

(9) Apt is the phrasing of J. KREMER, *Lukasevangelium* (Würzburg 1988) 128: "Die aus unterschiedlichen Textelementen zusammengestellte Verteidigungsrede Jesu..."

cerned, from its beginning to its concluding story, with explanations as to why Jesus should not be considered a tool of Beelzebul, it is likely (admittedly not automatically) that the unclean spirit story, too, will offer some kind of explanation which would serve to separate Jesus from Beelzebul. The emphasis in this argument is on an expectation that all the parts of an uninterrupted speech⁽¹⁰⁾ serve to promote the goal of that speech. In this case, all parts can be expected to help convince his enemies that Jesus is not under the power of Beelzebul.

How then can we more usefully describe the speech of Jesus, up to 11,24-26⁽¹¹⁾? Notably it consists of a variety of arguments to achieve one goal. The arguments may be described as follows.

First, Beelzebul would be fighting only himself if he, who is determined to destroy human beings through possession, would frustrate attempts at that very possession. Thus, it is illogical to hold that Jesus drives out demons because of Beelzebul (vv. 17b-18).

Secondly, how is Jesus's exorcism different from those exorcisms done by the children of those criticizing him? If their exorcisms are from God, his must also be from God. No enemy has noted that Jesus's exorcisms are distinctive. Thus, again it is contradictory and illogical, given the sociological reality, to say that Jesus is from Beelzebul (v. 19).

Thirdly, a proper paradigm by which to explain the facts of what the crowd has just seen Jesus do is that of "a stronger man

⁽¹⁰⁾ Because Jesus's speech is uninterrupted, it is not helpful, from the point of view of rhetorical logic, to divide the speech after v. 23 in order to give the last three verses of the speech a special title, such as "The Return of the Unclean Spirit" — which is what is done in *The Greek New Testament* (ed. K. ALAND *et al.*) (Stuttgart ³1983) 259. Such a division may help source critics, but the speech is a unit and should be signaled that way.

⁽¹¹⁾ R. TANNEHILL, *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts*. Vol. 1: *The Gospel according to Luke* (Philadelphia 1986) 149, speaks clearly of 11,17-26 as a response to the first challenge to Jesus. D.P. MOESSNER, *Lord of the Banquet*. The Literary and Theological Significance of the Lukan Travel Narrative (Minneapolis 1989) 227, n. 59, understands Luke to intend a union of 11,21-22 with 11,24-26 as "two parabolic statements [which] illustrate the main point of the preceding story, a procedure typical of Luke...". While the present essay does not explore Moessner's hint in any thorough way, the suggestion is worth studying which says that 11,20 is the central feature of Jesus's defense discourse. It is in 11,20 that Jesus turns from self-defense to posit that the kingdom of God has come.

dispossessing a strong man". This paradigm suggests that the stronger man is enemy to the strong man; the former wants what the latter has, and takes it by force, destroying the weapons on which the strong man depended (vv.21-22). The ultimate goal of this argument is that the only true interpretation of Jesus's exorcism is that the kingdom of Beelzebul is conquered and the kingdom of God has arrived, for if Jesus does not exorcise by the power of Beelzebul, he must exorcise by the power of God (v. 20). Thus, again it is illogical to interpret Jesus's exorcising to be the work of Beelzebul; rather this work must be the conquest of Beelzebul by God.

The purpose in describing these first three arguments of Jesus's speech is to show that he is approaching his enemy's claim from various directions, each of which contributes in its own way to a right conclusion that he is the antithesis of Beelzebul, that his exorcism reveals, from a variety of points of view, an empowerment, not by Beelzebul, but by God. Ultimately, each argument points up, in its own way, the illogicality of associating Jesus with Beelzebul.

What we justly look for in the story of the wandering unclean spirit, then, is an argument which shows how illogical it is to say that Jesus is from Beelzebul; moreover, this will be an argument which most likely will not imitate the first three, but will only join them in support of the central theme of Jesus's speech.

Let us now look to the story itself for guides to its proper meaning and function in Jesus's response to the assessment that he "drives out demons by the power of Beelzebul".

III. Second Positive Argument: Twelve Important Aspects of the Story

1. There are sixteen verbal (mostly all "action") words in this story: ten verbs and six participles.

Of the ten verbs, eight have as their subject the unclean spirit. A ninth verb, *katoikei*, includes the unclean spirit in its subject. The tenth verb, *ginetai*, has *ta eschata* as subject. This division clearly shows that, of the (few) mentioned characters of vv.24-26, the unclean demon (9/10) is the subject/doer of the story.

Of the six participles, three have as their subject the unclean spirit. Two participles describe the exorcised man (*sesarōmenon* and *kekosmēmenon*) and one participle (*eiselthonta*) includes the unclean

spirit. This division shows that the unclean spirit is subject/doer of four participial actions out of six in the story. One can further highlight the importance of the unclean spirit by noting that the remaining two participles are passive in meaning, the result of an earlier action and not representing action within the story. From an "action" perspective, then, the dominating character of the verses is the unclean spirit.

2. Correlative to the above point is the fact that *to akatharton pneuma*, the subject of so many verbs and participles, need be mentioned only once, and this at the very beginning of the parable. That the speaker mentions only once, and at the beginning, the identity of his central "doer" indicates the speaker's degree of concentration on this particular subject. It is the unclean spirit which dominates the attention of the speaker and hearer.

3. Further, whereas the unclean spirit is dynamic in the story, the *anthrōpos* is passive and unmoving; he is noted as the one *from whom* the spirit departs (v. 24), as the "house" *from which* the spirit exited (v. 24), who is now found *cleaned and ordered* (v. 25), as the *ekei* where unclean spirits dwell (v. 26a), and as the one whose *condition* is now worse than before (v. 26b). At best, the man can be called cause when his condition is the motive why the unclean spirit goes to bring seven other spirits to live in him; but his "causality" is hardly dynamic⁽¹²⁾. The dynamic one of the parable, the one who makes things happen, is the unclean spirit.

4. In speaking of the dynamics of the story's development, it is important to underline that the conclusion (the man's condition is worse than before) is a static statement; it is the result of the actions of the one who has dominated the story from the beginning. Thus, while it is true that the story's internal *goal* is to be able to affirm

⁽¹²⁾ There is a tendency to consider, when the effect of exorcism is described as the cleansing and adornment of a house, that the man is "ready to attract a passerby, or prepared for the reception of a guest", FITZMYER, *Gospel*, 925. This consideration can lead to the further inclination to think that the exorcised man is not yet "complete", but lacking something. Understanding the entire passage quite differently, J. ERNST, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (Regensburg 1977) 376-377, remarks: "Die ausmalende Beschreibung des ordentlich hergerichteten und geschmückten... Hauses will nur naiv verdeutlichen, dass der geheilte und darüber hinaus der vom Heiligen Geist erfüllte Mensch für den Satan immer eine Herausforderung ist".

that the man's condition is worse than ever, the bulk of the story is an *explanation*, centered on the activities of the unclean spirit, of how this man's condition came about.

5. The condition of the man as it is described in v. 26b cannot be due simply to his being *sesarōmenon kai kekosmēmenon*; the story's dynamic, meant to lead to the final description of the man, starts well before, with the wandering of the unclean spirit in search of rest⁽¹³⁾. The full action which leads to this bitter conclusion, then, is traced most completely to a spirit which is in search of rest. The particular causality which can be attributed to the healed state of the man is the spirit's intention not to remain alone, but to have seven other, worse spirits join him in possessing the man.

6. A further look at the verb-pattern indicates that, of the ten verbs in the story, the eight main verbs are all in the present tense, except one that is in the future (*hypostrepsō*). This is the factor which makes of the story a description of what is characteristic of the exorcised unclean spirit⁽¹⁴⁾. It does not mean that the unclean spirit always acts precisely in the steps described in the story; that would be saying too much⁽¹⁵⁾. But the constant present tense does leave the impression that what is being described is characteristic of an unclean spirit. In this way, the story is not the description of what one spirit did one time after being driven out of a man; it is the description of what is natural for an unclean spirit to do. With the present tense we are between the one extreme of a unique, singular event and the other extreme of "this is the way it always happens". We are reading about what it is the nature of an unclean spirit to do.

(13) While it is true that the dynamic of the story actually begins with the spirit's going out of the man, the "going out" is in a subordinate clause — which emphasises the main verb, i.e., the wandering.

(14) There is admittedly a certain tension created when one wishes to insist both that Jesus's story is meant to be "typical" (cf. JEREMIAS, *Gleichnisse*, 196, refers to Jesus's story "als allgemeine Erfahrungstatsache"; LAGRANGE, *Luc*, 333: "La pericope est donc simplement un cas typique, une parabole") and that Jesus's story is the continuation of the fate of a "particular" demon. MARSHALL, *Luke*, 480, notes an earlier opinion of Beyer who, critical of H. Nyberg's interpretation of *euriskon*, "claims we have the story of a possible contingency told as if it had once happened; the intention is to convey a general truth, but the conditional character of the circumstances has become obscured".

(15) Cf. LAGRANGE, *Luc*, 334-335: "Le cas est posé absolument comme cas typique plutôt que comme règle invariable".

7. One can point to a certain, definite linkage between the story and the exorcism (11,14); this link of exorcism with story is all the more striking for the paucity of detail with which this exorcism is told. It is said (v. 14) that, *tou daimoniou exelthontos*, the dumb man spoke. The story begins by laying down the first circumstance: "When the unclean spirit *exelthē* from the man" (v. 24). It seems clear that this is a comment meant to continue the train of thought begun with the description of the cure: the demon went out... (and) when the unclean spirit went out...

That v. 24 continues a thought begun in v. 14 means that the story of the wandering spirit is more surely seen now as linked to the experience which gave rise to Jesus's speech. Insofar as this linking is verified, the story can well be understood to be an interpretation of the exorcism or some element of it. Whatever the meaning of the story turns out to be, it is clear enough that Luke wants to reflect in story form upon what happens (emphasis, again, on the present tenses) once that exorcised demon leaves his possession.

Noteworthy, in this lead-off verse 14, is the change of title from *daimōn* (Luke 11,14 = Matt 12,22) to *akatharton pneuma* (Luke 11,24 = Matt 12,43)⁽¹⁶⁾. Most certainly Luke 11,24-26 = Matt 12,43-45 represent the Q tradition⁽¹⁷⁾. Striking is the fact that, while Luke and Matthew seem to follow the Marcan text (3,20-27) of Jesus's defense regarding his exorcising, the term to describe the "evil possessor(s in Mark)" in all that is common to the three synoptics (generally Mark 3,20-27/Luke 11,15-22/Matt 12,22-30)⁽¹⁸⁾

⁽¹⁶⁾ Cf. ERNST, *Lukas*, 373: "Das Stichwort ' unreiner Geist ' zeigt an, dass die Beelzebulrede und das Wort vom Rückfall in einem direkten Zusammenhang gehören"; 376: "Mit dem Stichwort ' unreiner Geist ' wird wieder das leitende Thema der Beelzebulrede aufgenommen"; B. RIGAUX, *Témoignage de l'évangile de Luc* (Brussels 1970) 235: "Seul le mot croché ' démon ', ' esprit immonde ' justifie le rapprochement "; FITZMYER, *Gospel*, 925: "In the immediate context, it [unclean spirit] could refer to that mentioned in v. 14".

⁽¹⁷⁾ Of special note: not only is the wandering unclean spirit story absent in Mark, but so is notice of the individual exorcism which starts off the Lucan and Matthean defense discourse of Jesus regarding his exorcising. That Luke 11,24-26 is from Q, cf. FITZMYER, *Gospel*, 924; W. SCHENK, *Synopse zur Redenquelle der Evangelien* (Düsseldorf 1981) 69.

⁽¹⁸⁾ Cf. MOESSNER, *Lord*, 226, n. 50: "Many scholars view 11:14-23 as stemming essentially from Q, while Matthew (9:32-34; 12:22-30) combines Mark and Q. This of course is disputed"; for a detailed discussion, cf. R.

is *daimōn*, never to *akatharton pneuma*; to *akatharton pneuma* appears as the word of Q.

But Luke welcomes the Q term rather than changes it to fit his consistent *daimōn* terminology in 11,14-23, for the uncleanness⁽¹⁹⁾ of the demon is a worthy beginning to what Luke means to describe about this evil being. His story about the demon will show just how "unclean" this spirit characteristically is. The change, then, from *daimōn* to *akatharton pneuma* brings out immediately the ugliness Luke now wants to depict in story form about this being; in its own way this new description of the demon shows that the story Jesus tells is concerned with the evilness of the nature of the demon.

8. The story Jesus tells is, for his audience, a reasonable description of what the unclean spirit does. That is, by its silence the presumed audience of Jesus agrees that the plot Jesus unfolds is quite reasonable, starting from the "going out to dry places in search of rest" to the terrible end the demon visits upon the man. While each twist and turn of plot may not be inevitable (the demon had, along the way, a number of possible choices to choose from), the audience has no objection to any moment of the plot, including the eventual repossession of the man. From the audience's silence, then, we can argue that Jesus's hearers see this story as a succession of demonic options, culminating, in their own logic, in the destruction of a human being. For the audience, the story does not begin with the finding of the man "cleansed and put in order", but with the expulsion and wandering; it is all of a logical pattern for Jesus's listeners. For the audience, it is very reasonable that an unclean spirit start out in search of rest in dry places, but finish in a terrible destruction of a human being. The audience understands that it is following, not the story of an irreligious man, but the story of a spirit bent on making human beings unclean.

BULTMANN, *History of the Synoptic Tradition* (tr. by J. Marsh; Oxford 1963) 13-14.

⁽¹⁹⁾ Eventually, Jesus will refer to seven, worse spirits; if the unclean spirit (v.24) affirms the uncleanness of the demon, "the 'seven spirits' probably symbolize the totality of evil or uncleanness", FITZMYER, *Gospel*, 925; E. ELLIS, *The Gospel of Luke* (Grand Rapids 1974) 128, "...indicating the severity of the possession". Contra, LENSKI, *Gospel*, 642, who takes the number 8 (7 + the initial demon) as literal: "he [demon] sees that there is room enough for eight ... any imitation of the sacred number seven is ruled out".

9. There is an awful combination of terms in the narration; indeed, the short story ultimately creates a violent contrast. On the one hand we read of "rest" and "my house"⁽²⁰⁾ ("whence I went"), terms which to the hearer are positive and warm. When all is said and done, however, these words have been translated into "the last condition is worse than the first". What is this humanizing, then destructive description of the spirit meant to achieve?

However one might be tempted to understand *anapausis* at first, it is ultimately very clear that the search for rest has ended in the satisfying destructive possession of the human being. It seems that we are permitted to understand this destruction to be either what the spirit thinks to be rest or a very satisfactory substitute for it⁽²¹⁾.

To have the spirit desire to return to its former "house" intensifies the bitterness of the spirit's action, for "my house" and destruction of it are, to human thinking and hope, incompatible. That the desire for "rest" in "my (former) house" ends in a fate seven times worse than before reveals the cruelty by which the unclean spirit overturns symbols that human beings cherish.

"Rest" becomes destruction, the destruction of a "house", which should mean "home". The parable, by the collocation of certain meaningful terms, conveys the horribleness of the unclean spirit's destructive nature⁽²²⁾.

10. One element of the story-line is worth particular attention here. It is the spirit's decision to seek out seven other, worse spirits,

⁽²⁰⁾ That the possessed person is described also elsewhere as a "house" is noted by C. EVANS, *Luke* (Peabody, MA 1990) 186: in b. *Hullin* 105b and b. *Gittin* 52a; cf. also W. WIEFEL, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (Berlin 1988) 222.

⁽²¹⁾ FITZMYER, *Gospel*, 925, describes this element of Jesus's story as "typical protological thinking of ancient Palestinian demonological beliefs (that spirits, especially evil ones, must dwell somewhere and are not satisfied with nomadic roaming through arid, desert wastelands)"; MARSHALL, *Luke*, 479, remarks: "The point is perhaps not the dryness but the absence of men from such desert regions, so that the demon cannot find anywhere to rest". Contra, LENSKI, *Gospel*, 641: "Jesus is not voicing opinions that were current in his time". Lenski thinks this is the right conclusion to draw from the fact that it seems useless to describe as general practice a demon's search for rest in places he is doomed never to find it.

⁽²²⁾ Cf. EVANS, *Luke*, 494: "But they are driven by their nature to look for permanent abode ... in the bodies of men"; JEREMIAS, *Gleichnisse*, 196: "Erfindet in der Wüste ... keine Ruhe, weil er sich nur da wohlfühlt, wo er Unheil stiften kann".

once the unclean spirit sees the cleanliness and orderliness of the man. Why this plot factor? Because it reveals the kind of reaction Jesus's effect on the man has on the unclean spirit. One can see better than ever the contradiction that exists between Jesus and the demon, as one can see that the effects of Jesus's work are precisely what induce, not simply repossession by one demon, but the imposition of a condition which totally obliterates what Jesus has accomplished⁽²³⁾. Where the plot had first described the demon as simply searching for rest, it now describes its unleashing the fullness of demonic possession, as soon as the demon finds the man cleansed and put in order. The possession by the demon and seven others worse than it is not described as the fault of the man; rather, this enormous destruction is caused by the demon's evil desire to destroy what had been made clean and put in order.

It is here, in the demon's decision to repossess totally, that one senses the point of Jesus's small story. Not only is there no compatibility between Jesus's work and demon's work; the demon hastens to destroy what Jesus has achieved — and seems willing to call this destruction its rest.

11. We have noted earlier the passive role of the man, and underlined the centrality and dynamism of the unclean spirit, identified as the protagonist of the plot. By doing this, however, we have not exhausted the *personae* in the story. Though somewhat in the background, Jesus is still very present to the narrative. As noted earlier, the unclean spirit "went out"⁽²⁴⁾, a reference and link to the earlier imperative action of Jesus in v. 14. Jesus is at the origin, then, of this plot which begins with the demon's going out in search of rest.

Further suggestive reference to Jesus occurs in the second usage of *ekselthōn* (v. 24); the reader is reminded again of the unwilling departure of the demon and hence its cause for leaving.

⁽²³⁾ PLUMMER, *Luke*, 305, notes that the seven spirits are "covetousness, hypocrisy, spiritual pride, uncharitableness, faithlessness, formalism and fanaticism"; WIEFEL, *Lukas*, 186, is one of those who call attention to the unclean spirits identified in "Test. Ruben 2f".

⁽²⁴⁾ Cf. JEREMIAS, *Gleichnisse*, 196: "*Ekselthē* ist Aramaismus (Meidung des Passivs), also: wenn ein Dämon ausgetrieben wird". The passive sense, then, suggests Jesus is the cause of the exorcism (v. 14).

The effect of Jesus's exorcism was described earlier as his freeing the *kōphos* to speak; now it is described in broader terms: *sesarōmenon kai kekosmēnon*⁽²⁵⁾.

These three moments in the story centered on a demon are sufficient to keep in the reader's mind the role Jesus plays here. The effect of Jesus is to rid the man of what oppresses him and to make the man *sesarōmenon kai kekosmēnenon*⁽²⁶⁾. The effect of the demon is to destroy the man by making him many times worse than before. Jesus sends demons away and restores to health; he cannot be said to work to sustain demonic goals.

12. Finally, as Jesus and unclean spirit show their true natures, the irony cannot be ignored: the demon does its worst destruction precisely by destroying the good Jesus had effected. Ever clearer becomes the contradiction that exists between Jesus and the unclean spirit. If the earlier words of Jesus about the strong and stronger men (vv.21-22) had not already been applied to the demon (the strong one) and to Jesus (the stronger one), one might be tempted to interpret the story to say that the work of Jesus is supplanted by the many demons who rejoice to destroy what he has accomplished. In thinking this way, however, it becomes clearer that Jesus's description of the inclination of the wandering unclean spirit is ultimately meant to contrast severely what Jesus does and what the unclean spirits do for human beings.

Conclusion

We have marshalled three types of observation. First, there is a reluctance to see in the words *sesarōmenon kai kekosmēnenon*, whether from themselves or from their context, the suggestion that

⁽²⁵⁾ Cf. EVANS, *Luke*, 495: "This describes the result of the previous exorcism, the effect of possession being regarded as filth and interior chaos"; contra, RIGAUX, *Témoignage*, 235, who notes that only (*seul*) the *mot crochet* (demon/unclean spirit) links 11,24-26 with 11,14.

⁽²⁶⁾ Though FITZMYER, *Gospel*, 925, is technically correct that "We are not told by what power the unclean spirit has been expelled: whether by the 'finger of God', by Jesus' 'power' (see 5:17), or by that of Jewish exorcists (see v.19)", there seems to be little doubt that Luke intends the exorcist to be understood to be Jesus. Fitzmyer himself suggests this when he notes that "in the immediate context" the unclean spirit might refer to the demon of v.14 (925); PLUMMER, *Luke*, 304, remarks that this cleansing and putting in order is "not likely a reference to Jewish exorcists".

this healed man had no faith in Jesus (God). Secondly, the speech of Jesus can be expected, unless the opposite is proved true, to be a series of arguments to defeat the claim that he exorcises because he is in the service of Beelzebul. Thirdly, many aspects of the story Jesus tells (vv. 24-26) argue that the focus of the parable is on the nature of the demon, which is to destroy⁽²⁷⁾, and on the fact that it will do its utmost damage precisely to contradict what Jesus accomplished for the man. What do these three elements add up to, then?

Key factors in the vocabulary, story structure and placement in the speech of Jesus argue that the story of the unclean spirit is a story meant to reveal the nature of the demon. This revelation, in turn, is contrasted with the revelation of what Jesus accomplishes through exorcism. This all adds up to the interpretation that this small story (Luke 11,24-26) is one more argument that Jesus is not in league with Beelzebul. As other arguments show, so this one shows now in story form why the identification of Jesus with Beelzebul is essentially illogical. The nature of Jesus is to heal, to "cleanse and put in order", whereas the nature of the unclean spirit is to "make the condition of the man worse than ever before".

The intention of Jesus all through his speech is to make clear the impossibility that he is empowered by Beelzebul⁽²⁸⁾. Jesus himself, always the correct and final interpreter, finally interprets everything properly: "It is by the finger of God that I exorcise, so the kingdom of God is upon you". The small story Jesus tells in verses 24-26 makes its contribution to a proper exegesis of Jesus's having driven out the demon, that unclean spirit whose nature is to destroy what Jesus cures⁽²⁹⁾.

Pontifical Biblical Institute
Via della Pilotta, 25
I-00187 Rome

John J. KILGALLEN SJ

⁽²⁷⁾ PLUMMER, *Luke*, 305, interprets *katoikei* (v. 26) to mean "*permanent* abode" (his stress). This understanding increases even more the destruction revealed to be in the nature of the unclean spirit(s).

⁽²⁸⁾ "The NT view of demons ... bring[s] out the demonic nature of their activity as an attack on the spiritual and physical life of man in fulfilment of the will of Satan. The NT bears witness to the victory won by Jesus over evil spirits", W. FOERSTER, *daimōn*, *TDNT* II, 19.

⁽²⁹⁾ This essay has interpreted the story of the wandering unclean spirit in such an unconventional way that it suggests an unconventional interpretation of v. 23 as well. Under the influence of vv. 24-26 and, more

SOMMAIRE

Dans leur exégèse de Lc 11,24-26, la plupart des exégètes pensent que le «être purifié et mis en ordre» du v.25 renvoie au manque de foi qui empêcherait une re-possession démoniaque. Dans cet essai on montrera que cette péricope devrait (1) ne pas être interprétée de cette manière; et (2) être comprise comme un complément de description du thème de base, à savoir: pourquoi l'on ne peut dire que Jésus a exorcisé par le pouvoir de Bêlzeboul.

generally, of the inclination to keep all members of Jesus's speech focused on his goal of self-defense against the charge that he functions for Beelzebul, it seems right to say that the "one who is not with me" is the demon, the unclean spirit"; he proves to be "against me". Likewise, that "not to gather with me" is to do the contradictory opposite ("to scatter") suggests that it is the demon, the unclean spirit, which is contradictorily opposed to Jesus, for the demon does just the opposite of Jesus — if Jesus gathers, the demon scatters. In this way, even the proverbial or minatory (FITZMYER, *Gospel*, 924) saying of v.23 serves to deny any attempt to link Jesus with Beelzebul; the natures of the two, as seen in their works, are absolutely incompatible. That v.23 belongs to the original Q source and serves to lead into the wandering spirit story, cf. SCHENK, *Synopse*, 69-70; this suggests that even at the Q level the meaning of the wandering spirit story likely determines the meaning of v.23.

Historical Issues in Isaiah 22,15-25

Isa 22,15-25 consists of a condemnation of Shebna, the major-domo under Hezekiah king of Judah (vv. 15-18); an announcement that Shebna will be dismissed, and replaced by Eliakim (vv. 19-23); and a second (later) announcement that Eliakim and his relatives, who are using his position and influence to secure jobs and increase their wealth, will be overthrown (vv. 24-25). This essay addresses major historical issues raised by Isa 22,15-25 as the historical data in this pericope stand in relationship to the historical data in Isa 36-37=2 Kgs 18-19 which pertain to it and to extrabiblical information. It discusses the identity of the major-domo rebuked and threatened in vv. 15-19; the meaning of the prediction that the functioning major-domo will be taken into exile and removed from office in vv. 17-19 and its fulfilment; the time at which Eliakim was to, and did, replace this major-domo; and the meaning of the prediction that Eliakim and his relatives will be "cut down and fall" in vv. 24-25 and its fulfilment.

I. Issues Pertaining to Shebna

There is good reason to believe that the oracle now preserved in Isa 22,15-23 was addressed to Shebna the steward of Hezekiah from its inception. Verse 15c appears in its present position in 1QIsa^a and all the ancient versions. There is no reason why a later redactor would insert this line into the text⁽¹⁾. It appears to contradict Isa 36,3 and 37,2, for it describes Shebna as "steward" and "he who is over the house", whereas these latter texts state that Shebna was the "secretary" or "scribe" under Hezekiah and that "he who is over the house" was Eliakim. *'el* and *'al* are often used synonymously

(1) The suggestion of R.E. CLEMENTS, *Isaiah 1-39* (NCBC; Grand Rapids 1980) 188, that someone inserted this phrase in Isa 22,15 from Isa 36,3 and 37,2 to connect 22,15-25 with distinguished individuals of Hezekiah's court during the crisis posed by Sennacherib is not convincing.

and interchangeably in the OT⁽²⁾, so the appearance of the phrase “to this steward” beginning with *’el* followed by the phrase “to Shebna” beginning with *’al* in apposition to it reflects good Hebrew style. It is common for Yahweh to mention *by name* the individual to be addressed when he commissions a prophet to proclaim his words to that person (2 Sam 7,5; 1 Kgs 12,23; 21,18-19; Isa 7,3-4; 38,5). OT writers often give two (or more) appellations to the same individual in the same OT context (2 Sam 3,38; 5,2; Ezra 7,11.12), so the reference to Shebna in synonymous official terms as “steward” and “(he who is) over the house” is the type of syntactic construction one would expect.

The Shebna of Isa 22,15-23 is the same person as the Shebna of Isa 36,3.11.22; 37,2=2 Kgs 18,18.26.37; 19,2⁽³⁾. The name “Shebna” in Isa 22,15 is unusual in Hebrew in that it ends with an *aleph*; but it is spelled in the same way in all the other texts cited above except 2 Kgs 18,18.26⁽⁴⁾. It is hardly likely that two people named Shebna were royal officials under Hezekiah⁽⁵⁾. Although the names of the father of Eliakim and of the father of Joah are given in the relevant passages listed above, the name of Shebna’s father is never mentioned⁽⁶⁾. The weight of evidence, then, suggests the probability that the Shebna of Isa 22,15-23 is the same individual as the Shebna of Isa 36-37=2 Kgs 18-19.

Apparently Shebna was a Judean⁽⁷⁾. It is highly unlikely that the Judean government would have accepted a foreigner as major-domo. There are many Hebrew proper names that end with an

⁽²⁾ For an extensive discussion of this point, citing numerous OT texts where this phenomenon occurs, see my study, “Textual and Linguistic Issues in Isaiah 22,15-25”, forthcoming in *ZAW* (1993).

⁽³⁾ So A. KAMPHAUSEN, “Isaiah’s Prophecy concerning the Major-Domo of King Hezekiah”, *AJT* 5 (1901) 49-50, 51; O. PROCKSCH, *Jesaja I* (KAT IX; Leipzig 1930) 289; J. FISCHER, *Das Buch Isaias* (Bonn 1937) 159; J. ZIEGLER, *Isaias* (Würzburg 1960) 75; and J. SCHARBERT, *Die Propheten Israels bis 700 v. Chr.* (Köln 1965) 265.

⁽⁴⁾ J. RIDDERBOS, *De Profeet Jesaja I* (Kampen 1940) 145.

⁽⁵⁾ F. FELDMANN, *Das Buch Isaias übersetzt und erklärt* (EHAT 14/1; Münster 1925) 269.

⁽⁶⁾ FELDMANN, *Das Buch Isaias*, 269; RIDDERBOS, *De Profeet Jesaja*, 145.

⁽⁷⁾ There is nothing to support the proposals of R. MARTIN-ACHARD, “L’oracle contre Shebnâ et le pouvoir des clefs, Es. 22,15-25,” *TZ* 24 (1968) 247, that Shebna was probably a North Israelite who fled to Judah.

aleph, as 'āgē', "Agee" (2 Sam 23,11); 'ēlā', "Ela" (1 Kgs 4,18); 'āsā', "Asa" (1 Kgs 15,8.9.11.13); and so on. "Shebna" is a shortened form of "Shebnayahu" or "Shebaniah", which is a well-attested Hebrew name (Neh 9,4,5; 10,5; 12,14; 1 Chr 15,24). "Shebna son of Achab" appears on a seal from Lachish⁽⁸⁾, and the proper name "Shebna" is found on other Palestinian seals. "Shebna the servant of Uzziah" occurs on a seal of the Louvre no. 106216⁽⁹⁾. These considerations suggest that the Shebna of Isa 22,15 was a native Judean⁽¹⁰⁾, not a foreigner⁽¹¹⁾. The name of Shebna's

⁽⁸⁾ D. DIRINGER, *The Alphabet: A Key to the History of Mankind* (London 1948) 123-124, no. 57; J.C.L. GIBSON, *Textbook of Syrian Semitic Inscriptions* 1 (reprint; Oxford 1973) 61, 63.

⁽⁹⁾ According to H. WILDBERGER, *Jesaja* (BKAT 10/2; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1978) 837.

⁽¹⁰⁾ So FELDMANN, *Das Buch Isaias*, 269, 270; R.W. ROGERS, "Isaiah", *The Abingdon Bible Commentary* (eds. F.C. EISELEN-E. LEWIS-D.G. DOWNEY) (Nashville 1929) 648; PROCKSCH, *Jesaja* I, 288; FISCHER, *Das Buch Isaias*, 159; A. BENTZEN, *Jesaja 1, Jes. 1-39* (København 1944) 173; A. PENNA, *Isaia* (SB.VT; Roma 1958) 211; J.Y. MUCKLE, *Isaiah 1-39* (London 1960) 78; E.G. KRAELING, *Commentary on the Prophets I* (Camden 1966) 106; MARTIN-ACHARD, "L'oracle contre Shebnā", 246, 247; P.H. KELLEY, "Isaiah", *The Broadman Bible Commentary* 5 (ed. C.J. ALLEN) (Nashville 1971) 256; A. SCHOORS, *Jesaja* (Roermond 1972) 135; O. KAISER, *Isaiah 13-39. A Commentary* (OTL; London 1974) 152; WILDBERGER, *Jesaja*, 836-837; J.D.W. WATTS, *Isaiah 1-33* (Waco 1985) 290; and S.H. WIDYAPRANAWA, *The Lord is Savior: Faith in National Crisis. A Commentary on the Book of Isaiah 1-39* (Grand Rapids 1990) 128.

⁽¹¹⁾ It is unnecessary, therefore, to seek the origin of the name "Shebna" in the Egyptian *šbnw* or *šbnw šrj* (as do R. DE VAUX, "Titres et Fonctionnaires Égyptiens à la Cour de David et de Salomon", *Bible et Orient* [Paris 1967; first published in *RB* 48 (1939)] 394-405; and E.J. YOUNG, *The Book of Isaiah II* [NICOT; Grand Rapids 1969] 106), or in an Aramean or Syrian name since it ends with an *aleph* (as do J.A. ALEXANDER, *Commentary on the Prophecies of Isaiah I* [Grand Rapids 1846] 386, 391; KAMPHAUSEN, "Isaiah's Prophecy", 50, 72; T.K. CHEYNE, *The Prophecies of Isaiah I* [New York 31884] 137; *The Book of the Prophet Isaiah* [SBOT 10; New York 1898] 159; A. DILLMANN, *Der Prophet Jesaja* [KEHAT V; Keipzig 61898] 202; K. MARTI, *Das Buch Jesaja* [KHCAT X; Tübingen 1900] 174-175, 176; K. FULLERTON, "A New Chapter out of the Life of Isaiah", *AJT* 9 [1905] 622; O.C. WHITEHOUSE, *Isaiah I-XXXIX* [Edinburgh 1905] 257; E. KOENIG, "Shebna and Eliakim", *AJT* 10 [1906] 676; G.H. BOX, *The Book of Isaiah* [London 1908] 103; G.A. SMITH, *The Book of Isaiah I* [New York 1908] 317; J. SKINNER, *The Book of the Prophet Isaiah Chapters I-XXXIX* [CBSC; Cambridge 41909] 168, 170; B. DUHM, *Das Buch Jesaja übersetzt und erklärt* [GHKAT; Göttingen 41922] 163-164;

father is not given because he was an upstart, a parvenu, an individual of ignoble birth⁽¹²⁾, not because he was a foreigner⁽¹³⁾. This helps explain why Isaiah was angry because Shebna was overseeing the work of hewing out a tomb for himself among the tombs of those of noble birth in Jerusalem (v. 16). His ancestry demanded that he be buried in "the burial place of the common people" (2 Kgs 23,6; Jer 26,23).

The prophet reproves Shebna for his ostentation and pretentiousness in hewing out a magnificent tomb for himself in a conspicuous place where all passersby could view it (Isa 22,16), and in appearing before the people with pomp and ceremony in his splendid state chariots (v. 18). In contrast to Shebna, Eliakim will be a "father" to the inhabitants of Jerusalem and to the house of Judah (v. 21). Hence, the biblical text explicitly describes Shebna's offense as self-engrossment which is so consuming that he has no concern for the well-being of the people under his care⁽¹⁴⁾.

G. W. WADE, *The Book of the Prophet Isaiah* [London 1929] 146, 147; RIDDERBOS, *De Profeet Jesaja*, 143; BENTZEN, *Jesaja* 1, 173; S. MOWINCKEL, "Jesajaboken. I. Kap. 1-39. De Senere Profeter", *GTMM* III [Oslo 1944] 139; I. W. SLOTKI, *Isaiah* [London 1949] 104; H. W. HERTZBERG, *Der Erste Jesaja* [Kassel 1952] 92; G. G. D. KILPATRICK, "The Book of Isaiah: Chapters 1-39, Exposition", *IB* 5 [Nashville 1956] 293; P. AUVRAY-J. STEINMANN, *Isaïe* [Paris 1957] 101, n.e.; and J. N. OSWALT, *The Book of Isaiah Chapters 1-39* [NICOT; Grand Rapids 1986] 419).

⁽¹²⁾ G. B. GRAY, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Isaiah I-XXXIX, Vol. I: Introduction and Commentary on I-XXVII* (ICC; New York 1912) 377; J. BRIGHT, "Isaiah—I," *Peake's Commentary on the Bible* (repr.; ed. H. H. ROWLEY) (London 1967) 505; MARTIN-ACHARD, "L'oracle contre Shebnâ", 247, 250; and SCHOORS, *Jesaja*, 135.

⁽¹³⁾ Contra ALEXANDER, *Isaiah*, 386; DILLMANN, *Der Prophet Jesaja*, 202; FULLERTON, "A New Chapter", 632; SMITH, *The Book of Isaiah* I, 317; WADE, *Isaiah*, 146; A. VAN HOONACKER, *Het Boek Isaias* (Brugge 1932) 123; RIDDERBOS, *De Profeet Jesaja*, 143; MOWINCKEL, "Jesajaboken. I", 139, 140; E. J. KISSANE, *The Book of Isaiah* I (Dublin 1960) 244; SCHARBERT, *Die Propheten Israels*, 264, n. 3; and YOUNG, *The Book of Isaiah* II, 106.

⁽¹⁴⁾ Many scholars reason that the strong words and severe punishment announced in vv. 16-19 assume a much more serious offense than self-centeredness and neglect of the people. The predominant proposal is that Shebna was advocating that Hezekiah and Judah send to Egypt for help against Assyria rather than trusting in Yahweh, whereas Isaiah counseled them to trust in Yahweh and not to rely on Egypt's military

The prophets considered vainglory a very serious offense. They consistently chastised leaders of God's people for serving their own selfish interests to the neglect and hurt of those under their care (Isa 1,16-17.23.26; 3,13-15; Jer 23,1-4; Ezek 34,1-10). Hence, it is in line with a common prophetic emphasis to proclaim severe punishment with strong words against leaders of God's people who neglected or hurt those under their charge. A more serious offense was not necessary for the prophets to utter such oracles.

In Isa 22,17-18, the prophet announces that Yahweh will send an enemy to carry Shebna into exile; whereas in v.19, Yahweh declares that he will remove Shebna from his "office" or "station". But it is not logical to announce that one will be removed from office *after* announcing that he will go into exile. Removal from office must *precede* being taken into exile. On the other hand, it may be that v.17a declares that Shebna will lose his office and that v.19 repeats this⁽¹⁵⁾, or that the announcement that Shebna will be carried into exile in vv.17-18 implies or presupposes that he will be removed from office, which the text does not explicitly state until v.19⁽¹⁶⁾.

When all the evidence is taken into consideration, it seems most likely that in vv. 17-19 Isaiah announces that Shebna will be removed from office and carried into Assyrian exile⁽¹⁷⁾, never to return to Jerusalem because he will die in Assyria⁽¹⁸⁾; however,

strength (cf. Isa 30,1-7; 31,1-3; and see especially A. VACCARI, *I Profeti—I. Isaia-Geremia* [La Sacra Bibbia 6; Firenze 1952] 75; KELLEY, "Isaiah", 256-257; and J. JENSEN, O.S.B., *Isaiah 1-39* [OTM 8; Wilmington, Delaware 1984] 183-184; "Isaiah 1-39", *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary* [eds. R. E. BROWN, S.S.—J. A. FITZMYER, S.J.—R. E. MURPHY, O. Carm.] [Englewood Cliffs 1990] 243). But there is no explicit statement or even implicit hint in Isa 22,15-25 that Shebna's political views provoked this prophetic oracle.

⁽¹⁵⁾ So KISSANE, *The Book of Isaiah* I, 241.

⁽¹⁶⁾ So WADE, *Isaiah*, 148.

⁽¹⁷⁾ Most scholars think the "wide land", literally "the land (country) wide of hands", i.e., "spreading out or extending in every direction" (cf. Gen 34,21; Judg 18,10), of v.18 is the plain of Mesopotamia, and thus Assyria. However, ALEXANDER, *Isaiah*, 388-389, proposes that it refers to Shebna's own native land (whether that be Syria, Phoenicia, Mesopotamia, or Assyria); and G. FOHRER, *Das Buch Jesaja* I (ZBK; Zürich 21966) 254, that it refers to Philistia.

⁽¹⁸⁾ This is the view of A. BARNES, *Book of the Prophet Isaiah* II (London 1852) 35; MARTI, *Das Buch Jesaja*, 175; GRAY, *Isaiah I-XXXIX* I,

what actually was that Shebna was removed from the office of major-domo, but was not carried into exile.

Isaiah's enunciation that Shebna will be carried into exile is analogous to Amos' declaration concerning Amaziah (Amos 7,17), and to Jeremiah's message to Pashhur (Jer 20,4-6)⁽¹⁹⁾. However, Isa 36,3.22; 37,2 (= 2 Kgs 18,18.37; 19,2) show that Shebna did not go into exile. Rather, Hezekiah replaced him as major-domo with Eliakim (as Isaiah announced in 22,19-22), and made him secretary or scribe⁽²⁰⁾.

Now according to some OT texts, one criterion for determining a "true" prophet is that his "predictions" come to pass (Deut 18, 21-22; Jer 28,9). But this is not always valid (cf. Deut 13,2-4; Jer 18,7-10). The OT contains many "unfulfilled" predictions of "true" prophets (see Jonah 3,4-10; Mic 3,12 + Jer 26,16-19; Isa 38,1-6); prophetic predictions are conditional or contingent⁽²¹⁾. Although we are

374; FELDMANN, *Das Buch Isaias*, 270; FISCHER, *Das Buch Isaias*, 159; VACCARI, *I Profeti* 1, 75; ZIEGLER, *Isaias*, 75; L. ALONSO SCHÖKEL, *Isaias* (Los Libros Sagrados 9; Madrid 1968) 111-112; L. A. SNIJDERS, *Jesaja* I (POT; Nijkerk 1969) 219; SCHOORS, *Jesaja*, 136; WILDBERGER, *Jesaja*, 839; and CLEMENTS, *Isaiah* 1-39, 187.

⁽¹⁹⁾ Cf. MARTI, *Das Buch Jesaja*, 174; and KOENIG, "Shebna and Eliakim", 681.

⁽²⁰⁾ So CHEYNE, *The Prophecies of Isaiah* I, 137, 138, 139; KAMPHAUSEN, "Isaiah's Prophecy", 73; A. CONDAMIN, S.J., *Le Livre d'Isaïe* (EB; Paris 1905) 153; BOX, *The Book of Isaiah*, 103; WADE, *Isaiah*, 146; RIDDERBOS, *De Profeet Jesaja*, 143; BRIGHT, "Isaiah—I", 505; G. L. ARCHER, Jr., "Isaiah", *The Wycliffe Bible Commentary* I (eds. E. F. PFEIFFER—E. F. HARRISON) (Chicago 1963) 625; SCHARBERT, *Die Propheten Israels*, 201, 263-265; J. MAUCLINE, *Isaiah* 1-39 (TBC; London 1970) 173-174; A. S. HERBERT, *The Book of the Prophet Isaiah. Chapters 1-39* (Cambridge Bible Commentary; Cambridge 1973) 138; WILDBERGER, *Jesaja*, 836; and WATTS, *Isaiah* 1-33, 292-293.

⁽²¹⁾ A basic principle at work in prophetic predictions is the prophet's presupposition that the realization of his announcements is "contingent" on God's sovereign rule (cf. Isa 10,5-19; Dan 4,34-35), on the response of his hearers (cf. Jer 18,7-10), on subsequent events which might add new or different elements to the situation in which a prediction was made and cause it to be irrelevant or superseded by other concerns or factors; and so on (see A. J. HESCHEL, *The Prophets. An Introduction* [New York 1962] 194; R. B. Y. SCOTT, *The Relevance of the Prophets* [New York 1968] 10-12; R. P. CARROLL, "Prophecy and Dissonance. A Theoretical Approach to the Prophetic Tradition", *ZAW* 92 [1980] 108-119; and B. VAWTER, "In-

not in a position to know all the details, the oracle concerning Shebna in Isa 22,15-19 is one example of this.

II. Issues Pertaining to Eliakim

Isa 22,20-23 contain Yahweh's announcement that he will replace Shebna with Eliakim as major-domo in Judah. While the expressions describing Eliakim's function in the Judean government in vv. 21-22 are used of kings elsewhere in the OT (see e.g., Isa 9,5-6; Zech 3,1-10; 6,9-15)⁽²²⁾, they are also used of high officials other than the king. *Ketōnet* (v.21) is the term for the "coat" or "robe" of Joseph (Gen 37,3,23), Job (Job 30,18), Israelite priests (Exod 28,4.39-40), and so on. *'abnēt* (5x in Exodus: 28,4.39.40; 29,9; 39,29; and 3x in Leviticus: 8,7.13; 16,4) is a "sash" or "girdle" used to bind the "coat" to the body, always referring to a priestly sash. *Memšālā* (Isa 22,21) refers both to *subordinate* (Gen 1,16[2x]; Ps 136,8.9; cf. the cognate noun *mimšāl* in 1 Chr 26,6) and to *primary* "authority" or "rule" (Jer 34,1; Mic 4,8). Therefore, it would fit a high official like the major-domo. *'ab* (Isa 22,21) is one of the titles for the coming king announced in Isa 9,5: "Father of Eternity", "Everlasting Father". However, Joseph, as major-domo in Egypt, says that God had made him a *father* to Pharaoh (Gen 45,8). The

roduction to Prophetic Literature", *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary* 189b-190a, 195b).

⁽²²⁾ Several scholars interpret Isa 22,20-23 as an announcement that Yahweh will establish as king the person in view. K. FULLERTON, "A New Chapter", 637-642; id., "Shebna and Eliakim: A Reply", *AJT* 11 (1907) 507-509, argues that it is an oracle of the prophetic party in the time of Manasseh attempting to replace Manasseh with Eliakim on the throne. WILDBERGER, *Jesaja*, 846, thinks this text refers to a certain Eliakim who actually ruled the kingdom of Judah after Jehoiachin was taken into exile. J. VERMEYLEN, *Du Prophète Isaïe à l'Apocalyptique. Isaïe, I-XXXIX, miroir d'un demi-millénaire d'expérience religieuse en Israël* (EB; Paris 1977) I, 340-342; and (1978) II, 688-691, reasons that originally Isa 22,20-23 did not pertain to Eliakim the son of Hilkiah, but to the ideal king of Judah—Josiah. CLEMENTS, *Isaiah 1-39*, 188, 190-191, contends that a redactor living in the reign of Josiah used the titles in Isa 22,21-22 to exalt the royal office of Hezekiah whom Eliakim served. Eliakim was not king, but as major-domo, he was closely associated with his master (cf. v. 18).

“key of the house of David” (Isa 22,22) was an insigne worn by the highest official in Judah under the king, the major-domo, as a symbol that the king had entrusted into his hands all the authority of the royal administration (cf. Matt 16,19; Rev 3,7)⁽²³⁾. Isa 22, 20-23, then, contain a divine announcement by the prophet that Eliakim the son of Hilkiah will soon receive the office of major-domo from which Shebna is about to be removed (v. 19).

Isa 22,24-25 conflict sharply with vv. 15-23. According to vv. 15-23, Yahweh will remove Shebna, Jerusalem’s ruling major-domo, from his office, send him into Assyrian exile, and replace him with Eliakim the son of Hilkiah. But according to vv. 24-25, Eliakim’s kinsfolk will pressure him to give them high governmental positions because of their relationship to him, he will succumb to that pressure and practice nepotism, and both he and they will fall. It is inconceivable that these two parts of this text were delivered to the same audience on the same occasion. The words now recorded in vv. 24-25 were undoubtedly spoken and/or written after those found in vv. 20-23, after it had become clear that Eliakim had not lived up to the high aspirations which Isaiah had held and uttered about him on the occasion when he denounced Shebna and proclaimed his deposition⁽²⁴⁾.

The language of vv.24-25 indicates that this oracle was delivered while Eliakim was still serving as major-domo in Judah, *after a few* of his relatives had succeeded in pressuring Eliakim to help them attain high governmental positions in Judah, but *before the majority* of his relatives had become a burden to him by urging him to provide them with lucrative positions like the few who had already done so. The “peg” or “nail that was fastened in a sure place” of v.25 refers to the “peg in a sure place” of v.23, but in

⁽²³⁾ In addition to the commentaries, on several of these points see especially KOENIG, “Shebna and Eliakim”, 683-684.

⁽²⁴⁾ Some commentators contend that v. 25 is a summary of the oracle concerning Shebna in vv.15-19, and does not refer to Eliakim. Others suggest that v.24 is the protasis, and v.25 the apodosis, of a conditional sentence pertaining to Eliakim, and translate: “If they hang on him the whole weight of his father’s house,... in that day,... the peg that was fastened in a sure place will give way...”. Still others conclude that vv. 24-25 refer neither to Shebna nor to Eliakim, but to an anonymous opponent of the redactor responsible for the addition of these verses at a later time. For the arguments advanced to support each of these views and scholars who advocate each view, see my article mentioned in n.2 above.

v. 23 this “peg” is clearly Eliakim, not his relatives. The announcement in v. 24 that “they will hang on him (Eliakim) the *whole* weight of his father’s house” suggests that at the time this oracle was originally uttered or written, they had hung on him only *some* of the weight of Eliakim’s father’s house, yet not enough weight for the peg to be cut down and fall, and for the burden that was upon it to be cut off (v. 25)⁽²⁵⁾. Accordingly, it seems most likely that Isaiah⁽²⁶⁾ or one of his disciples⁽²⁷⁾ delivered the oracle now recorded in vv. 24-25 after Eliakim’s relatives had begun bringing pressure on him to help them gain eminent positions for themselves in Judah, and after he had begun yielding to that pressure, thereby frustrating the great hopes Isaiah had expressed concerning him in Yahweh’s behalf while Shebna was still major-domo (vv. 20-23).

III. Reconstruction of the Historical Events Involving Shebna and Eliakim

The conclusions derived from the various attempts to do an exegesis of Isa 22,15-25; 36,3.11.22; 37,2; and other relevant OT texts are inseparably intertwined with efforts to reconstruct the historical events pertaining to Shebna and Eliakim. The most likely reconstruction⁽²⁸⁾ is that Hezekiah made Shebna major-domo of his

(25) On this point, I cannot agree with C.R. SEITZ, *Zion’s Final Destiny: The Development of the Book of Isaiah: A Reassessment of Isaiah 36–39* (Minneapolis 1991) 113, that v. 25 means that the burden that was placed on Eliakim and his household will finally be lifted, i.e., that the responsibility of Eliakim and his kinsfolk was limited to one period in history, and after that it ceased to exist. The whole negative tone of vv. 24-25 against Eliakim and his relatives is too strong for this.

(26) So CHEYNE, *The Prophecies of Isaiah* I, 139; G.A. SMITH, *The Book of Isaiah* I, 318-319; and KISSANE, *The Book of Isaiah* I, 242, 246.

(27) So BOX, *The Book of Isaiah*, 103; ROGERS, “Isaiah”, 649; WADE, *Isaiah*, 146; FISCHER, *Das Buch Isaias*, 160; HERTZBERG, *Der Erste Jesaja*, 93; FOHRER, *Das Buch Jesaja* I, 255; and MARTIN-ACHARD, “L’oracle contre Shebnâ”, 242-243.

(28) The proposals that Isa 22,20-23 and 22,24-25 are late pre-exilic or post-exilic additions (MARTI, *Das Buch Jesaja*, 176-177; DUHM, *Das Buch Jesaja*, 163-164; MOWINCKEL, “Jesajaboken. I”, 140; and MARTIN-ACHARD, “L’oracle contre Shebnâ”, 242-243); that Isaiah delivered the oracle now recorded in Isa 22,15-25 near the time of Sargon II’s siege and defeat of Ashdod in 711 BC (GRAY, *Isaiah-I-XXXIX* I, 374; PROCKSCH, *Jesaja* I, 374; VACCARI, *I Profeti* 1, 75; SCHARBERT, *Die Propheten Israels*, 263-265;

empire (which is assumed in Isa 22,15) some time between his accession to the throne (715 BC) and the Assyrian siege of Jerusalem (701 BC). Shebna became arrogant because of his high governmental position, which he manifested by having a tomb hewn out for himself in an envious location (Isa 22,16), and by appearing pompously at public gatherings in his splendid state chariots (Isa 22,18). Isaiah condemns Shebna for his arrogance. He announces that Shebna will be carried into Assyrian captivity, die there, and lose his splendid chariots to his captors. Thus Shebna will be removed from the office of major-domo, and Eliakim will replace him (Isa 22, 16-23). Some time before the Assyrian siege of Jerusalem in 701, Hezekiah removed Shebna from his position as major-domo, demoted him slightly to the office of state secretary, and elevated Eliakim to the role of major-domo, as is suggested by the fact that Shebna was secretary and Eliakim major-domo when the Assyrians besieged the city (Isa 36,3.11.22; 37,2)⁽²⁹⁾. However, there is nothing

VERMEYLEN, *Du Prophète Isaïe* I, 340; II, 674; CLEMENTS, *Isaiah 1-39*, 187, 189; and OSWALT, *The Book of Isaiah*, 417); that Isa 22,15-25 originally addressed the political intrigues in the early years of the reign of Manasseh c. 689-680 BC (FULLERTON, "A New Chapter", 630-642; id., "Shebna and Eliakim", 504-509); and that Isaiah uttered the message now preserved in Isa 22,15-25 *after* Sennacherib lifted the siege of Jerusalem in 701 BC (J.H. HAYES-S.A. IRVINE, *Isaiah the Eighth-Century Prophet: His Times & His Preaching* [Nashville 1987] 284, 286-287) or *during* that siege (DILLMANN, *Der Prophet Jesaja*, 202; WHITEHOUSE, *Isaiah I-XXXIX* I, 256-257; and VAN HOONACKER, *Het Boek Isaïas*, 123) fail to account for all the details stated or assumed in the texts under consideration.

⁽²⁹⁾ Among the scholars who assign the date of the replacement of Shebna by Eliakim as major-domo and the demotion of Shebna to the office of secretary to the period *before* the Assyrian siege of Jerusalem recorded in Isa 36-37 are CHEYNE, *The Prophecies of Isaiah* I, 137, 138; MARTI, *Das Buch Jesaja*, 175; CONDAMIN, *Le Livre d'Isaïe*, 153; BOX, *The Book of Isaiah*, 103; SMITH, *The Book of Isaiah* I, 316-318; SKINNER, *Isaiah*, 168; GRAY, *Isaiah I-XXXIX* I, 376; WADE, *Isaiah*, 146; PROCKSCH, *Jesaja* I, 289; RIDDERBOS, *De Profeet Jesaja*, 143, 145; BENTZEN, *Jesaja* 1, 172; AUVRAY-STEINMANN, *Isaïe*, 101, n.c.; KISSANE, *The Book of Isaiah* I, 242; MUCKLE, *Isaiah 1-39*, 78; MARTIN-ACHARD, "L'oracle contre Shebnâ", 248-249; MAUCLINE, *Isaiah 1-39*, 173-174; KELLEY, "Isaiah", 257; P. AUVRAY, *Isaïe 1-39* (Paris 1972) 213-214; SCHOORS, *Jesaja*, 134; WILDBERGER, *Jesaja*, 836; CLEMENTS, *Isaiah 1-39*, 189 (possibly); J.F.A. SAWYER, *Isaiah 1* (ed. J.C.L. GIBSON) (The Daily Study Bible [Old Testament]; Philadelphia 1984) 195; and WATTS, *Isaiah 1-33*, 292. BRIGHT, "Isaiah—I", 505, dates these events shortly before Sennacherib's "second campaign" into Judah in 688 BC.

to indicate that the Assyrians carried Shebna into captivity with his splendid chariots, or that he died in a foreign land, as Isaiah had proclaimed. During the Assyrian siege of Jerusalem, Eliakim the major-domo, Shebna the secretary, and Joah the recorder meet the Rabshakeh as Hezekiah's embassy. The Rabshakeh warns them that if the Judeans do not surrender to Assyria, the Assyrians will overthrow Jerusalem just as they had overthrown numerous other cities. These three ambassadors bring this message to Hezekiah with great fear. Hezekiah becomes fearful, and sends them to Isaiah to ask that he pray that Yahweh will deliver the city. Isaiah assures them that Yahweh will deliver Jerusalem from the Assyrians, and this occurs (Isa 36-37). After the Assyrians leave Jerusalem, Eliakim's relatives gradually put more and more pressure on him to use his high position to help them acquire lucrative and enviable governmental positions, and he succumbs to this pressure. Isaiah or one of his disciples reproves this nepotism, and declares that it will become increasingly worse until Eliakim can no longer bear the burden his relatives are forcing upon him, and will fall, i.e., lose his position as major-domo and/or something worse; and his relatives will fall with him (Isa 22,24-25). There is no information to indicate what happened to Eliakim ultimately.

College of Biblical Studies
Abilene Christian University
ACU Station Box 8448
Abilene, TX 79699 USA

John T. WILLIS

SOMMAIRE

Avant l'invasion de Sennachérîb en 701 A.C.N., Isaïe annonce que le majordome en place sous Ézéchiâs, Shebna, sera démis de ses fonctions, emmené en exil en Assyrie et y mourra en raison de son arrogance. Il sera remplacé par Éliakim qui servira Juda comme il convient (Is 22,15-23). Cependant, Shebna ne sera jamais emmené en exil. Il sera toutefois relégué à un poste de secrétaire et Éliakim le remplacera comme majordome (Is 36,3.11.22; 37,2). Assez vite, Éliakim cède aux pressions de ses parents qui lui demandent de leur procurer des positions lucratives dans le gouvernement de la Judée. Isaïe ou l'un de ses disciples déclarent alors qu'Éliakim et sa famille déchoiront pour cette raison (Is 22,24-25). Nous n'avons aucune information sur ce qu'il advint d'Éliakim par la suite.

ANIMADVERSIONES

Psalm 116: Disconnected Text or Symmetrical Whole?

Over the years, a considerable number of problems have dominated the research history of Psalm 116⁽¹⁾. In this article we concentrate on only one of these, and that is the cohesion and structure of the psalm. The interesting phenomenon is that the research into this matter has moved in two completely divergent directions.

On the one hand there are those who disallow the existence of any logical line of thought or structure in the psalm. Gunkel⁽²⁾, for example, makes the following comment on the psalm: "Der Psalm enthält die verschiedenartigsten Bestandteile... scheinbar ohne jede Ordnung". Quite a number of researchers concur with Gunkel's opinion on this point⁽³⁾. On the other hand there are those who detect a deliberate symmetrical structure in the psalm⁽⁴⁾.

The aim of this article is to debate the above-mentioned approaches by means of an independent, comprehensive analysis of Psalm 116 involving a consideration of the morphological, syntactic, stylistic and semantic aspects. Because Barré has given the most recent exposition of the psalm, he features most prominently in this article.

Various Opinions

Before I proceed with my analysis of Psalm 116, I should begin by endeavouring to explain how it is possible, as indicated above, for two such divergent points of view on Psalm 116, to exist. Of course, it is impossible to say in anticipation that one (or both) of the views mentioned above is

⁽¹⁾ See M. L. BARRÉ, "Psalm 116: Its Structure and its Enigmas", *JBL* 109 (1990) 61 for a summary of these problems.

⁽²⁾ H. GUNKEL, *Die Psalmen* (GHKAT II/2; Göttingen 1926) 500.

⁽³⁾ On this point J. A. EMERTON ("How does the Lord regard the Death of his Saints in Psalm cxvi.15?", *JTS* 34 [1983] 147) remarks: "...it is not always possible to see any close logical connection between particular verses and those that precede or follow them". Also see J. P. M. VAN DER PLOEG, *Psalmen*, II (BOT VIIb; Roermond 1974) 280 and especially H.-J. KRAUS, *Psalmen*, 2. Teilband (BKAT XV/2; Neukirchen 1966) 793 who are in close agreement with Gunkel. M. BUTTENWEISER, *The Psalms* (Chicago, IL 1983) 642, also thinks that Psalm 116 "has suffered considerable disorder in the course of transmission". He reorganises the verses in such a way as to form what he views as a logical whole. E. KISSANE, *The Book of Psalms* (Dublin 1954) 210, concedes that "the sequence of thought is not so confused as Gunkel maintains", but, at the same time, he says that the psalm does not form a logical whole.

⁽⁴⁾ See, for example, BARRÉ, "Psalm 116", 61-79; R. L. ALDEN, "Chiastic Psalms (III): A Study in the Mechanics of Semitic Poetry in Psalms 101-150", *JETS* 21 (1978) 206; P. AUFFRET, "Essai sur la structure littéraire du Psaume 116", *BN* 23 (1984) 32-47; P. AUFFRET, "Je marcherai à la face de Yahvé". Étude structurelle du Psaume 116", *NRT* 106 (1984) 383-396.

right or wrong. Exegetical results should always be understood and judged according to the premise, paradigm and exegetical method of the exegete concerned, because these results are determined largely by the individual exegetical standpoint.

In order to understand why Gunkel says that Psalm 116 is "ohne Ordnung", we should realise that he has a *formgeschichtliche* approach. In terms of this approach, a psalm would consist of common forms and common elements of content which together point to a common setting in community. Consistently with his paradigm Gunkel expects that certain elements should appear in a fixed order in Psalm 116 which he views as an individual hymn of thanksgiving. If they fail to do so, the psalm, as happens with Psalm 116, is considered to lack cohesion. Hence Gunkel remains true to his own paradigm as applied to Psalm 116 and this explains his statement that it is "ohne Ordnung".

Gunkel's classification is a useful way of coming to grips with the psalms. On the other hand the Gunkelian categories tend to be a trifle forced. The *Gattungen* are not ready made schemes into which a psalm may be forced, but should rather serve as broad guidelines. The uniqueness, individuality and function of each psalm should be taken seriously.

Although Gunkel has remained true to his own approach in the case of Psalm 116, one can nevertheless criticise the fact that this approach does not give sufficient expression to the individuality of the psalm, that he imposes the prefabricated notion of *Gattung* onto the psalm and that this influences him to arrive at his aforementioned view of the psalm.

In contrast to the above approach according to which Psalm 116 is not necessarily a logical whole, there are those (referred to above) who do see it as a logical whole. Barré⁽⁵⁾, one of the representatives of this school of thought, spells out the exegetical guidelines along which he works as follows: "First, in investigating the structure of a poetic composition, it is not enough to consider the smaller parts and then put them together. One must first make the attempt to see the larger picture — for example, its overall symmetry, its major parts, etc."

Barré⁽⁶⁾ maintains that symmetry is one of the chief characteristics of Hebrew poetry. He believes that Psalm 116 consists of two symmetrical parts: vv. 1-9 and vv. 10-19. Of course, in doing so, Barré links up with the traditional division of the psalm into two. The LXX even permits the start of a new psalm at v. 10⁽⁷⁾. It also seems as if most commentaries have tended to be unduly influenced by this two-part division and have largely accepted it with too little discrimination. Barré bases his symmetry on a

⁽⁵⁾ "Psalm 116", 62-63.

⁽⁶⁾ "Psalm 116", 63.

⁽⁷⁾ Referring to this two-part division, B. DUHM, *Die Psalmen* (KHAT XIV; Freiburg i. B.-Leipzig-Tübingen 1988) 261, rightly says: "Ps 116 wird von der LXX unrichtig in zwei Psalmen, v. 1-9 und 10-19, zerlegt". One could also ask whether the LXX was not unduly influenced by the end of Psalm 56, thus also permitting Psalm 116 to end in a similar fashion at v. 9.

word count of the psalm⁽⁸⁾. Yet he remarks⁽⁹⁾ that “differing interpretations of the structure of the psalm are not necessarily mutually exclusive”. Hence he concedes that one proposed structure cannot claim to be *the* structure.

In the course of my own analysis, I shall be entering into further dialogue with Barré but I can make the following observations at this juncture: Can one really base a symmetry and division of a psalm on a word count? Although Barré also uses other criteria, he bases the above-mentioned symmetry of the psalm mainly on the word count. The question is whether text-critical changes, which are relevant to this psalm, would not disrupt Barré’s structure. Is this symmetry inherent in this psalm? In his word count, Barré follows the MT, but ignores the *maqṣef* of the MT “and count(s) each separately written series of letters in Psalm 116 as a word”⁽¹⁰⁾. It is striking that, in the case of v. 14 (= v. 18), Barré deviates from his own rule — although he does present apparently good arguments for this — to make his symmetry work out⁽¹¹⁾. Nevertheless, in all fairness to Barré, it should be said that he concedes that the word-counting method has its drawbacks⁽¹²⁾.

P. Auffret⁽¹³⁾, too, who starts with the final form of the text, considers Psalm 116 to be a logical whole. In fact, he also views the psalm as a symmetrical whole but his symmetry is totally different from that of Barré because he adopts another method. Auffret⁽¹⁴⁾ agrees with Alden⁽¹⁵⁾ who also sees the psalm as a great symmetry with vv. 8-11 as the centre and vv. 1-7 and vv. 12-19 as the inverted mirror images of each other⁽¹⁶⁾. Auffret who, as he puts it, is interested in the “structure littéraire” of the psalm and gives a detailed analysis of it in his typical manner, has refined the structure provided by Alden and speaks of successive, tripartite symmetrical concentric structures which overlap one another⁽¹⁷⁾. Auffret’s three overlapping units are vv. 1-6, vv. 6-14 and vv. 13-19. In the first unit (vv. 1-6) vv. 1-2 and vv. 4-6 form the frame with v. 3 as the centre; in the second unit (vv. 6-14) vv. 6-7 and vv. 12-14 form the frame with vv. 8-11 as the centre; in the third unit (vv. 13-19) vv. 13-14 and vv. 17-19 form the frame with vv. 15-16 as the centre. Eventually the centre of the middle

⁽⁸⁾ BARRÉ, “Psalm 116”, 63: “...I believe that the symmetry is based on word count rather than syllable count”. According to him the first part consists of 63 and the second of 64 words.

⁽⁹⁾ Ibid.

⁽¹⁰⁾ BARRÉ, “Psalm 116”, 63, n. 8.

⁽¹¹⁾ BARRÉ, “Psalm 116”, 64, n. 9.

⁽¹²⁾ BARRÉ, “Psalm 116”, 63, n. 8.

⁽¹³⁾ “Essai sur la structure”, 32-47; “‘Je marcherai’”, 383-396.

⁽¹⁴⁾ “Essai sur la structure”, 32-34; “‘Je marcherai’”, 383.

⁽¹⁵⁾ “Chiasmic Psalms”, 200.

⁽¹⁶⁾ The fact that ALDEN, “Chiasmic Psalms”, 199-210, sees symmetrical patterns in so many psalms, appears contrived and causes one to suspect that (consciously or unconsciously) he forces structures onto the psalms.

⁽¹⁷⁾ AUFFRET, “‘Je marcherai’”, 391, puts it thus: “Dans l’ensemble du psaume nous avons donc repéré successivement *trois symétries concentriques qui se chevauchent l’une l’autre, et où tour à tour*”

section, vv. 8-11, is, according to Auffret, the epicentre of the psalm. This symmetry is, however, not restricted to the global structure but is expressed on various levels⁽¹⁸⁾. In his detailed analysis, Auffret makes particular use of word repetitions, word occurrences and themes. I should like to make the following comments on this analysis by Auffret: although he presents a detailed analysis of the psalm, Auffret fails to give sufficient attention to all the techniques that characterise poetry⁽¹⁹⁾. Furthermore, it is noticeable that, in this case and in his other studies of the psalms, Auffret repeatedly tends to arrive at some or other type of symmetrical pattern. The question is whether these patterns are inherent to the psalm or whether the exegete (unconsciously) reads them into the psalm.

The Structure of Psalm 116

Next we come to my analysis of the psalm. I certainly do not claim that mine is the only or correct reading of the psalm. There is usually no such thing as an objective reading of a text. Hence, what I attempt to do is to use my approach to open up a dialogue with other exegetes.

Before considering the relationship between the specific stichs and the division into strophes, we shall begin with a look at the striking use of words and the repetitions of words and phrases.

The first noticeable point is the multiple use of the name Yahweh in the psalm, no less than 15 times (vv. 1.4[2x].5.6.7.9.12.13.14.15.16a.17.18.19; יהוה 19b), while the name God occurs once (v. 5, "our God"). It is logical to conclude from this that Yahweh is the central actant in the psalm.

The next striking characteristic of the psalm, in the form of suffixes and verbs, is the dominant occurrence of the first person singular. In conjunction with this is the occurrence of the personal pronoun אנכי. Moreover, this pronoun appears in pairs, in v. 10 and v. 11 and v. 16a and v. 16b. To this may be linked the repeated occurrence of אנכי in v. 4, v. 7 and v. 8 — therefore, especially in the first part of the psalm. Owing to this stress on the first person ("me/I") and the frequent occurrence of the name Yahweh, Yahweh and the supplicant emerge as the two most important actants in the psalm.

In this psalm there is, however, no direct reference to the "enemies", a theme which appears in numerous other psalms. All the same, there is a fairly general reference to כֹּל־הָאָדָם לֹא־יֵשֶׁר ("all men are liars", v. 11). In terms of actants, one could also mention that the psalm speaks of "his saints" (v. 15), "his people" (vv. 14.18) — that is, the fellow believers — and of "I" ("me"), the supplicant.

Although it does not necessarily have the same function each time, the particle כי occurs in a consistent fashion throughout the psalm (vv. 1.2.7.8.10.16).

⁽¹⁸⁾ See AUFFRET, "Essai sur la structure", 32-47; "'Je marcherai'", 383-396.

⁽¹⁹⁾ See W. G. E. WATSON's (*Classical Hebrew Poetry. A Guide to its Techniques* [JSOTSS 26; Sheffield 1986]) comprehensive approach.

The phrase **וְקָרָאתִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים** ("but/and I call on the name of the Lord") makes a noteworthy three appearances (vv. 4.13.17). The first time (v. 4) as part of a cry for help to Yahweh and the other two occasions, as part of prayers of thanks. One should add that the verb **קָרָא** also occurs in v. 2. The occurrence of this phrase causes prayer, which is directed to Yahweh, to emerge as an important theme.

The stem **שָׁע** occurs twice in the psalm: once in the form of a verb (v. 6) and once in the form of a noun (v. 13). This stem emphasises the salvific activity of Yahweh. In the same breath one could mention the verb stem **גָּמַל**, which also occurs twice. This word is also used to describe the favours of Yahweh. Like **שָׁע**, it occurs once in the form of a verb (v. 7) and once in the form of a noun (v. 12). Is it coincidental that, on each occasion, these two stems occur in close proximity to each other (vv. 6.7.12.13)? At this point one could also comment that the preposition **עַל** appears only twice in the psalm (vv. 7.12), both times in association with **גָּמַל**. An interesting play on words is effected between **תְּהַנֵּנִי** ("my prayers", v. 1) and **חַנּוּן** ("merciful", v. 5). In the first instance the stem **חָנַן** is used in the context of Yahweh's merciful deliverance. It is most probable that the word **מְנוּחָיִי** ("my rest", v. 7) may also be part of this word play.

The stem **שׁוּב** also occurs in a conspicuous way in the psalm: in v. 7, in the sense that the supplicant should "return" to rest because Yahweh has come to his assistance and in v. 12, as part of a rhetorical question, as to what the psalmist can "give back/return" to Yahweh in gratitude for his benefits. It follows logically that there are exceptionally strong bonds between v. 7 and v. 12 because, apart from the fact that this stem occurs in both, we have already pointed out (above) that the stem **גָּמַל** also occurs in vv. 7 and 12. A further similarity between the two stichs is that the preposition **עַל** is found in both.

The theme of death is strongly emphasised by the repetition of this word no less than three times in the psalm (vv. 3.8 and 15)⁽²⁰⁾. In v. 3 death is seen as an enemy. In v. 8 the supplicant is said to be saved from death and in v. 15 the "death of one of his people" is said to be **יָקָר** ⁽²¹⁾ in Yahweh's sight.

The expression **אָנָּה יְהוָה** ("O Lord") occurs twice: in v. 4 as part of a plea for help to Yahweh and in v. 16 as part of a confession by the psalmist that he is Yahweh's servant. The latter expression, **אֲנִי עַבְדְּךָ** ("I am your servant"), appears in two successive stichs, vv. 16a and 16b.

The particle **כָּל** ("all") occurs in two successive stichs ^(21a) (vv. 11 and 12). This creates a contrast between all Yahweh's good deeds (v. 12) and all those who are deceitful (v. 11). The contrast is developed even further in that v. 14 speaks of **כָּל-עֲמוֹ**.

⁽²⁰⁾ It is not necessary, as BARRÉ "Psalm 116", 71, would have it, to assign another meaning to **הַמָּוֶת** in v. 15 (see discussion below).

⁽²¹⁾ See the more detailed discussion below about this *crux interpretum*.

^(21a) The term 'stich' here signifies a line of poetry; the term 'hemi-stich' refers to one of its two parts. A stich consisting of three parts is referred to as a 'tristich'.

An additional notable point is the refrain, "In the assembly of all his people I will give Him what I have promised" which appears in v. 14 and v. 18.

Although it is naturally to be expected in any piece of literature, the preposition לְ ("for/to") occurs remarkably frequently in this psalm (vv. 2.6.7.9.12.14.15.16b.17.18). This preposition is used mainly in the context of what Yahweh does for the supplicant (or his "saints") or of the supplicant's grateful response to Yahweh.

Barré's⁽²²⁾ view that one should begin with the macrostructure is not entirely acceptable. It could imply the forcing of a structure on the psalm. In order to determine the structure one should commence with the smaller units. The unit worked with here is the stich or line of verse. Hence I work upwards from the building blocks. The first step, then, is to determine the relationship between the different stichs or lines of verse.

It is obvious that v. 1 and v. 2 are closely linked. V. 2 is syntactically dependent on v. 1 because this stich is introduced by a substantiating כִּי ("because he inclined his ear to me")⁽²³⁾ which provides the reason for the main clause "I love" in v. 1. In this sense v. 2 is also parallel to a section of v. 1 because it is there that the first causal clause ("because Yahweh had heard"⁽²⁴⁾ my voice"⁽²⁵⁾ and my supplications") is already encountered. König⁽²⁶⁾ also points out that the second part of v. 2 is a chiasmic, palindromic parallel to the first part of v. 1. There are also close associations between the contents of vv. 1 and 2. Both stichs deal with the fact that Yahweh listens to (cf. יִשְׁמַע v. 1; הִשָּׁא אָזְנוֹ v. 2) that is, brings deliverance to the supplicant. Although naturally not restricted to this part of the psalm, there are many *i* sounds, that are chiefly associated with the first person forms, in these two stichs. One notices that the object is missing from the verb אָהַבְתִּי in v. 1. However, Yahweh is clearly the implied object. By allowing the name Yahweh to fall away here, yet using it with the following verb (שָׁמַע) where Yahweh is the subject, the emphasis is placed on Yahweh as the active subject⁽²⁷⁾.

⁽²²⁾ "Psalm 116", 62.

⁽²³⁾ Even if the כִּי were viewed as affirmative or emphatic (as examples, see W. BEYERLIN, "Kontinuität beim 'berichtenden' Lobpreis des Einzelnen", H. GESE – H.-P. RÜGER [eds.], *Wort und Geschichte [Festschrift für Karl Elliger zum 70. Geburtstag]* [Neukirchen-Vluyn 1973] 19; M. DAHOOD, *Psalms III: 101-150* [AB; Garden City 1970] 146; E. KÖNIG, *Die Psalmen* [Gütersloh 1927] 447) it still remains a powerful connecting criterion.

⁽²⁴⁾ Apparently dittography has taken place here and the perfect (שָׁמַע) instead of the imperfect (שִׁמַּע) should be read (see L. C. ALLEN, *Psalms 101-150* [WBC; Waco TX 1983] 112; also H. SCHMIDT, *Die Psalmen* [HAT 2; Tübingen 1934] 210; D. MICHEL, *Tempora und Satzstellung in den Psalmen* [AET 1; Bonn 1960] 68-69; KRAUS, 793; F. CRÜSEMANN, *Studien zur Formgeschichte von Hymnus und Danklied in Israel* [WMNAT 32; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1969] 243; A. A. ANDERSON, *Psalms 73-150* [Grand Rapids 1983] 791).

⁽²⁵⁾ The suffix at קוֹלִי should be viewed as an archaic *status constructus* form and not as a first person singular ending (see e.g. DUHM, 260; C. A. BRIGGS – E. G. BRIGGS, *The Book of Psalms*, II [Edinburgh 1909] 401; GUNKEL, 502; W. O. E. OESTERLEY, *The Psalms* [London 1939] 476; CRÜSEMANN, 243; ALLEN, 112).

⁽²⁶⁾ *Die Psalmen*, 448.

⁽²⁷⁾ It is therefore unnecessary to make a text-critical change by moving the name Yahweh back to immediately after אָהַבְתִּי.

V.3 may be distinguished from the preceding by the fact that neither the supplicant nor Yahweh is its subject. The “cords of death” and “terrors of the grave” form the new subjects while the supplicant is the object. As far as contents are concerned, v.3 also differs from the previous verses because the plight of the supplicant is being described here. V.3 could be described as a tristich. The first two parts of the stich have a chiasmic structure:

אֶפְסֵי תְּכֵלִי-מָוֶת וּמַצָּרֵי שָׁאוֹל מְצָאוּנִי
a b b a

This chiasm accentuates the peril in which the supplicant finds himself and the personification⁽²⁸⁾ used here lends even greater emphasis to his plight. Although in the third leg of the tristich (צָרָה וְיָטִין אֶמְצָא) the supplicant is the subject once again, it still links up with the preceding section of the stich. This applies not only because of the contents — which concern the supplicant’s plight — but also because the same verb (מצא) which is used for the שָׁאוֹל is also used for the supplicant. The alliteration between the ז and מ consonants is also striking. V.4 undoubtedly links up very closely with what goes before. The *waw* with which v.4 is introduced — and which is, coincidentally, the only case in the psalm where this particle occurs at the beginning of a stich — connects this stich antithetically to v.3: in contrast to the perilous situation of the supplicant in v.3, the call of the Lord is described in v.4⁽²⁹⁾. P. Van der Lugt⁽³⁰⁾ correctly points out the rhyme between נַפְשִׁי (v.4) and מְצָאוּנִי (v.3). Although this is another reason for connecting the two stichs, one should note that, owing to the numerous first person suffixes — the factor on which this rhyme is based — rhyme is not only something restricted to the two stichs.

Owing to the assonance and the consequent end rhyme between v.2 and v.3 (אֶקְרָא v.2; אֶמְצָא v.3) and the repetition of אֶקְרָא in v.4, a close bond is forged between the combination of vv. 1-2 and vv. 3-4.

Moreover, there can be no doubt that vv. 5 and 6 form a close unit. In both the stichs Yahweh is the subject. By means of nominal sentences in v.5, the “characteristics” of Yahweh are listed, thereby emphasising the notion that he is merciful and just. The first hemistich of v.6 links up with the end of v.5 because both use a participle to describe the merciful action of Yahweh (מְרַחֵם v.5; שֹׁמֵר v.6). The second hemistich of v.6 is an intensification of the first: while the first part of v.6 speaks in general of Yahweh’s assistance to the helpless, the second speaks of Yahweh who has delivered “me”. In this sense the second part of v.6 is also a concentration of the second part of v.5, because in the latter hemistich “our” God is mentioned while in v.6 it is “me”.

⁽²⁸⁾ OESTERLEY, 76, expresses it as follows: “Death is figuratively represented as a cruel personality who entangles men with cords and ropes...”.

⁽²⁹⁾ There are some exegetes who say that v.4 is even syntactically dependent on v.3. For instance, MICHEL, 6, translates: “Als ich Not und Kummer finden mußte, da rief ich den Namen Jahwes an”.

⁽³⁰⁾ *Strofische Strukturen in de Bijbels-Hebreeuse Poëzie* (Kampen 1980) 397.

Various reasons may be given for the connection of vv. 7 and 8. Even if the כִּי which introduces v. 8 were to have an affirmative or emphatic function, as some exegetes think⁽³¹⁾, it remains a strong indication that v. 8 should link up with the previous stich. However, it is more probable that in v. 8, as in v. 7, this particle has a substantiating function: in contrast to the previous two stichs in which Yahweh is the subject, v. 7 is introduced by an imperative which the supplicant directs to himself. It is as though he is speaking to himself and telling himself to be at peace. In the second hemistich of v. 7 there is a substantiation for the imperative (שִׁבְחִי): "because (כִּי) Yahweh has been good to me". The first part of v. 8 is parallel to this and develops the substantiation. While in v. 7 there is a general description in the third person of the good deeds of Yahweh, v. 8 pinpoints and particularises these: Yahweh is addressed directly in the second person with the specific statement that "You saved me from death". The link between v. 7 and v. 8 is reinforced even more by the incidence of the word נַפְשִׁי in both stichs. V. 8 should be viewed as a tristich. The second and third parts are a further expansion of the first part. A characteristic of v. 8 is that the preposition בִּן occurs in each part of the tristichs. The trope of *merismus* ("eye" and "foot" as references to the whole of נַפְשִׁי) is also employed in v. 8. In addition there is a striking alliteration between דָּמָעָה and פָּדָתִי . Everything conspires to emphasise the comprehensive salvific activity of Yahweh.

A characteristic of vv. 9-14, which should be viewed as a stanza, is that first person singular forms of the verb are dominant. Hence the supplicant is the actant in this section. The view that a new section begins at v. 10 does not hold and is unduly influenced by the LXX which goes as far as allowing a new psalm to commence with v. 10⁽³²⁾. To provide further substantiation for the division of the psalm into vv. 1-9 and vv. 10-19, Barré⁽³³⁾ and others⁽³⁴⁾ argue that v. 1 and v. 10 correspond in the sense that each of these verses contains a verb in the perfect, followed by a כִּי and an imperfect. In each case Yahweh is the implied object. These parallel traits between v. 1 and v. 10 cannot be denied except that one could debate whether the imperfect in v. 1 may not be due to dittography. Without caricaturing Barré's argument, one could say that parallel traits between v. 1 and v. 10 cannot be used as a decisive argument for justifying the psalm's division into two. If Barré were consistent, he would have to apply the same argument used in v. 1 and v. 10 to the parallel traits between v. 7 and v. 12 — not to mention the refrain verses (vv. 14 and 18).

If the immediate context, namely the first person singular forms of the verb, is taken into account, then v. 9 is definitely linked more closely to v. 10 than to the preceding v. 8. But Barré uses another argument to prove

⁽³¹⁾ For example, R. KITTEL, *Die Psalmen* (KAT III; Leipzig-Erlangen 1922) 366; MICHEL, 68; KRAUS, 795; ALLEN, 112.

⁽³²⁾ Most commentaries agree with this without actually giving their reasons.

⁽³³⁾ "Psalm 116", 66-67.

⁽³⁴⁾ See, for example, A.F. KIRKPATRICK, *The Book of Psalms* (Cambridge 1903) 687.

that v.9 is the conclusion of a section. He maintains that there is a "correspondence of the endings [i.e., vv.9 and 19] of the major parts" ⁽³⁵⁾. Barré maintains that the expression בְּאַרְצוֹת הַחַיִּים (v.9, literally: "in the land of the living") forms a deliberate *paronomasia* with בְּהַצְרֹת בֵּית יְהוָה (v.19a) and that the expression "in the land of the living" is "an epithet of the Jerusalem temple". Barré's arguments ⁽³⁶⁾ do not, however, hold. He uses all sorts of other texts (Accadian, Sumerian and other texts in the Old Testament) — which, in terms of Psalm 116, are extratextual data — to show that the expression "in the land of the living" refers to the temple at Jerusalem. He fails, however, to pay sufficient attention to the textual context of Psalm 116 itself ⁽³⁷⁾. The point I wish to make is that this second hemistich of v.9 should be understood in its own context since then it goes without saying that the first hemistich of v.9 אֶתְהַלֵּךְ לִפְנֵי יְהוָה ("I walk in the presence of Yahweh") has an important contribution to make. The figure of speech used here is ellipsis because the verb that occurs in the first part of the verse ("I shall walk") also applies to the second part of the verse ("in the land of the living"). This trope is what creates such a close relation between two hemistichs. Hence, in the narrower context, the expression "in the land of the living" should be read in the light of the first hemistich. To be in the land of the living means to walk in the presence of the Lord. It also fits in well with the rest of the psalm because the psalmist praises the Lord for the fact that "cords of death" encircled him (v.3) but the Lord saved him from death (v.8). Thus death is contrasted with life. One of the chief reasons why the supplicant praises Yahweh is because he owes his life to Yahweh.

To show that vv.8-9 form a unit, Barré ⁽³⁸⁾ indicates, in imitation of Auffret and Alden, that verse 8 reveals a chiasmic ABC C' B' A' pattern. However, this argument does not hold because the word נָפְשִׁי is not taken into account in the pattern. Had this word also been accounted for, the chiasm, and hence also the argument that vv.8-9 forms a unit, would have fallen away. In my opinion, this is an example of structuralism where a structure is pressed upon a text.

One really cannot fail to point out that Barré makes the mistake of arguing in circles. In the one case ⁽³⁹⁾ he uses the bipartite division of the psalm in an attempt to show that the expression "in the land of the living" should be identified with the temple; and in the other case ⁽⁴⁰⁾ he uses the fact that "in the land of the living" is an indication of the temple, in an attempt to prove the two-part division. As a result, Barré's entire structure suffers.

⁽³⁵⁾ "Psalm 116", 67.

⁽³⁶⁾ Also see BARRÉ, "rs (h)hyym - 'The Land of the Living'", *JSOT* 42 (1988) 46-47.

⁽³⁷⁾ The irony is that BARRÉ, "Psalm 116", 70, accused Emerton of failing to pay sufficient attention to the context of Psalm 116,15 (see EMERTON, "How does the Lord", 146-156).

⁽³⁸⁾ "Psalm 116", 68.

⁽³⁹⁾ Cf. BARRÉ, "'The Land of the Living'", 47.

⁽⁴⁰⁾ Cf. BARRÉ, "Psalm 116", 67.

To repeat the argument: on the strength of the first person forms of the verb which occur consistently from vv. 9-14, a new section begins, not at v. 10, but at v. 9.

Next we shall consider the relationship of the lines of verse in the section vv. 9-14. To commence with the most obvious matters, the second hemistich of v. 10 (אֲנִי צִוִּיתִי) markedly resembles the first hemistich of v. 11 (אֲנִי אֶמְרָה). What we are dealing with here is an anadiplosis. For the rest both stichs contain verbs for speaking (דָּבַר v. 10; אָמַר v. 11). Hence vv. 10 and 11 are very powerfully connected. Because v. 9, as already indicated, introduces a new section, this verse can actually be linked only to v. 10 and v. 11⁽⁴¹⁾.

These criteria connect these two stichs so strongly that, despite what Van der Lugt⁽⁴²⁾ would claim, there is no primary bond between v. 11 and v. 12 and hence there is no totally new section at v. 13⁽⁴³⁾. I believe instead that vv. 12-14 form a strophe and that v. 12 is not, as Van der Lugt would have it, connected primarily upwards but rather primarily downwards. Of course one has to concede to Van der Lugt that the occurrence of the particle *ל* is notable in both v. 11 and v. 12 but there are other more convincing criteria for why v. 12 binds downwards first. One could say, in parenthesis, that the particle *ל* also occurs in v. 14. Thus one could just as well argue the particle creates an *inclusio* between v. 12 and v. 14. However, I do not wish to use this as an argument. I merely want to present it as an example of how Van der Lugt's argument using *ל* could also have been deployed differently. Van der Lugt⁽⁴⁴⁾ uses the similarities between v. 7 and v. 12 (cf. discussions above) to say that the two stichs form an *inclusio* and that vv. 7-12 therefore forms a stanza and that a new stanza begins at v. 13. The similarities between v. 7 and v. 12 could just as well have been used to argue that the stichs introduce new sections. Also note that the expression לַיהוָה ("to Yahweh") that occurs in v. 12 is resumed in v. 14 again. The chief reason why v. 12 needs to be connected with vv. 13-14, however, is the fact that vv. 13-14 is the answer to the question (מָה) asked in v. 12. The question of how Yahweh is to be recompensed for all his good deeds is answered by vv. 13 and 14. As vv. 13 and 14 are the answer, their content is naturally very closely related. It concerns the fact that the supplicant wishes to thank Yahweh in the cult, in the presence of the entire nation. The two hemistichs of v. 13 are structured in parallel, while those of v. 14 form an enjambment⁽⁴⁵⁾.

⁽⁴¹⁾ VAN DER LUGT, 398, also points out that the preposition *ל* occurs in both v. 9 and v. 11. Whether this may be used as a criterion for connecting v. 9 with vv. 10-11 is not quite so certain since this preposition also occurs in other places in the psalm.

⁽⁴²⁾ VAN DER LUGT, 339.

⁽⁴³⁾ VAN DER LUGT, 396-400, believes that the psalm consists of three equal parts, namely vv. 1-6, 7-12 and 13-19.

⁽⁴⁴⁾ VAN DER LUGT, 397, 399.

⁽⁴⁵⁾ Both DAHOOD, 145 and WATSON, 335 point out that the multiple occurrence of enjambment is a characteristic of Psalm 116 (see vv. 1.9.12.15.18).

Thus the stanza vv.9-14 consists, as argued above, of two strophes: vv.9-11 and vv.12-14. One could say that the particle *כִּל* serves as a *nexus* or link to connect the two strophes.

Our next step would be to consider the stich relationships of the last section of the psalm. What immediately comes to one's notice is the terrace pattern relationship between v.16a and v.16b. V.16a ends with *אֲנִי עֲבָדְךָ* while v.16b begins with the same expression. Hence, vv.16a and 16b form a close unit. For various reasons, vv.17, 18 and 19a also form a unit. The common factor between these three stichs is that they are concerned with describing various aspects of the cult. Vv.17 and 18 are very closely bound to each other because they contain repeated occurrences of verbs in the first person singular ("I shall sacrifice", "I shall call on", v.17; "I shall pay", v.18). Vv.18 and 19a are even more closely linked since there is a verb missing in v.19a — thus the figure of speech used is ellipsis — and v.19a is therefore syntactically fully dependent on v.18. Moreover there is also a striking alliteration to be seen between *אֶשְׁלֶם* (v.18) and *יְרִשְׁלֶם* (v.19a). The combinations vv.16a-16b and vv.17-19a are also connected by the fact that second person singular suffixes, referring to Yahweh, which are so prominent in vv.16a-16b ("your servant", v.16a; "your servant", v.16b; "the son of your maidservant", v.16b) are taken up again by the conspicuously foregrounded *הָ* in v.17. Crüsemann⁽⁴⁶⁾ correctly points out that vv.16 and 17, and v.8, are the only places in the psalm where Yahweh is directly addressed in the second person.

All the same, the question remains as to the nature of the relation of v.15 to the preceding and following stichs. The question is complicated by the fact that there are major problems regarding the meaning of the verse⁽⁴⁷⁾. This calls for a response to Barré again. He uses his twofold division of the psalm, whose weak points have already been pointed out above, to argue that *הַמּוֹתָה* in v.15 cannot mean "death". Once again he uses extratextual evidence, and in this case chiefly the Ahiqar text, and the explanation of *הַמּוֹתָה* as an Aramaism, to support his argument. In the light of the striking word repetitions in the psalm, particularly the important place assumed by the theme, "death", (cf. v.3 and v.8) — and also life — in this psalm it seems logical that *הַמּוֹתָה* will assume that meaning here in v.15 as well. Hence Barré's argument is not convincing. The solution to the problem of understanding this should rather be sought in *יָקָר*. In this context it seems as if *יָקָר* could mean something like "serious" or "precious" so that what the text is trying to say is that, to Yahweh, the death of one of his saints is a serious matter⁽⁴⁸⁾.

⁽⁴⁶⁾ CRÜSEMANN, 246.

⁽⁴⁷⁾ This paper does not provide an explanation for the problems with the meaning nor the attempts to solve them. EMERTON, "Death of his Saints", 146-155, may be consulted in this regard.

⁽⁴⁸⁾ EMERTON, "Death of his Saints", 154, is moving along the same lines with his translation: "Grievous in Yahweh's sight is the death of his saints". Also see KRAUS, 797 and VAN DER PLOEG, 284.

Returning to the relationship of v. 15 with the preceding and following stichs, we could remark that this stich differs from v. 14 and v. 16 in that it does not have the first person as its subject. In this sense v. 15 is a *Fremdkörper*. As regards contents and the use of words, v. 15 now fits in with the rest of the psalm, especially with the preceding section. One could point to the occurrence of מָוֶה (cf. v. 8 as well) and particularly to the theme of "death", which is an important theme in the psalm (cf. vv. 3 and 8, too). "His saints" in v. 15 also links up well with "his people" in v. 14. The preposition לְ which appears many times in the rest of the psalm (cf. discussion above), also appears in v. 15. In terms of this argument, v. 15 is more closely related to the preceding than to the succeeding section.

*
* * *

Now, if in the light of the whole course of the argument, we were to summarise the relationship of the various stichs, they link up as follows: vv. 1-4, vv. 5-6, vv. 7-8, vv. 9-14, v. 15, vv. 16-19a. The psalm concludes with a hymnic call in v. 19b. From all this we may conclude that a symmetrical or chiasmic structure, as advocated by some exegetes, is not really convincing. On the other hand, this does not exclude the possibility of any logical line of thought in Psalm 116, as maintained by certain other exegetes. As indicated, the psalm is characterised by numerous verbal and thematic repetitions. These give rise to a complex network of connections between the various parts of the psalm without being trapped in a scheme. Hence the psalm is neither a disconnected whole nor a symmetrical structure. The two points of view represent two extreme poles to be avoided, neither doing justice to the psalm.

Department of Old Testament
Faculty of Theology
University of Pretoria
Pretoria, 0002, South Africa

W. S. PRINSLOO

“Rather Boldly” (Rom 15,15): Paul’s Prophetic Bid to Win the Allegiance of the Christians in Rome

Two issues have stood at the forefront of Pauline studies in recent years; Paul’s attitude to the Jewish law and the purpose of his letter to Rome⁽¹⁾. The twin prominence of these issues is not surprising. Even a surface glance at the letter shows how central Paul felt the law to be both to issues agitating Christians in Rome and also to the matter of his own acceptance in that community.

Introduction: Paul’s Problem with the Law

On the more general question of Paul’s attitude to the law there is now a very wide spectrum of views—ranging from the “hard” Lutheran view of Bultmann and his school where the very attempt to keep the law is already sin⁽²⁾, to the opposite extreme represented by scholars such as J. C. Gager and L. Gaston, where Paul had no quarrel with Jewish (and Jewish-Christian) keeping of the law but sought simply to prevent the imposition of its ceremonial precepts upon Gentiles, who, in accordance with the promises to the “fathers”, had now come into their rightful inheritance⁽³⁾. This controversy concerning Paul and the law has been widely documented in recent publication and needs no lengthy review here⁽⁴⁾. For present purposes I shall indicate my own position on the

⁽¹⁾ See esp. the collection of studies in K. P. DONFRIED (ed.), *The Romans Debate* (revised and expanded edition; Edinburgh 1991); also, A. J. M. WEDDERBURN, *The Reasons for Romans* (Edinburgh 1991); S. WESTERHOLM, *Israel’s Law and the Church’s Faith: Paul and His Recent Interpreters* (Grand Rapids 1988).

⁽²⁾ Cf. R. BULTMANN, *Theology of the New Testament* (2 Vols.; London 1952-55) I, 264, 315; G. BORNMANN, *Paul* (London 1971) 123, 126-127; E. KÄSEMANN, *Commentary on Romans* (Grand Rapids 1980) 89-90, 103, 193-194; H. SCHLIER, *Der Römerbrief* (HTHKNT VI; Freiburg 1977) 223; E. SYNOFZIK, *Die Gerichts- und Vergeltungsaussagen bei Paulus* (Göttingen 1977) 88-89. For a critique of this tendency see, WESTERHOLM, *Israel’s Law*, 70-75.

⁽³⁾ C. GAGER, *The Origins of Anti-Semitism* (Oxford 1985) 197-264; L. GASTON, *Paul and the Torah* (Vancouver 1987) – esp. the essays, “Paul and the Torah” (pp. 15-34), “Israel’s Enemies in Pauline Theology” (80-99) and “Israel’s Misstep in the Eyes of Paul” (135-150).

⁽⁴⁾ See esp. WESTERHOLM, *Israel’s Law*, 70-86, 116-121; J. D. G. DUNN, “The New Perspective on Paul: Paul and the Law”, *Romans 1-8* (Word Biblical Commentary 38A; Dallas 1988) LXIII-LLXXII (also *Romans Debate*, 299-308); F. THIELMANN, *From Plight to Solution* (Leiden 1989) 1-27, 123-132; D. ZELLER, “Zur neueren Diskussion über das Gesetz bei Paulus”, *TP* 62 (1987) 481-499.

matter and set it in the framework of an overall interpretation of Paul's purpose in Romans, which I wish to present.

Contrary to Gaston, I do believe that Paul held reliance upon the law for eschatological justification to be incompatible with faith in Christ for *any* believer—Jew or Gentile. I would also maintain, against J. D. G. Dunn and others⁽⁵⁾, that the “works of the law” which Paul held to be incompatible with Christian faith embraced more than the “boundary-marking” precepts of Judaism (food-laws, circumcision, sabbath) that bolstered national pride and sense of superiority⁽⁶⁾. Paul's view of the radical incompatibility between faith in Christ and seeking to be justified on the basis of law as a total moral and religious system emerges from a whole range of texts: Rom 3,27-28 (especially when read in the light of the scriptural accusation against general sinfulness that culminates in 3,20); 4,4-5 (where Abraham's faith is defined precisely as faith in God who justifies the one who, *as sinner* [ἁμαρτήρ], has no works to show; cf. also the subsequent appeal to the psalm of repentance [Ps 32] in vv. 7-8); 9,30-10,8 (where the same dichotomy between “faith-righteousness” and “law-righteousness” [as “doing-righteousness” cf. ὁ ποιήσας, v. 5] appears; cf. also Gal 3,11-12; Phil 3,9; Rom 11,6)⁽⁷⁾.

But the clearest indication of all is given already in Gal 2,15-16⁽⁸⁾. In this text Paul, for the instruction of his errant Gentile converts in Galatia, rehearses the challenge he threw at Cephas in Antioch.

¹⁵“We are Jews by birth and not Gentile sinners. ¹⁶But knowing that a person is not justified from works of the law, but through faith in Christ, we too put our faith in Christ in order that we might be justified by faith in Christ and not by works of the law, because (as Scripture says), “from works of the law shall no flesh be justified” (cf. Ps 143,2).

⁽⁵⁾ DUNN, *Romans 1-8*, LXIII-LXXII, 153-155; also A. SEGAL, *Paul the Convert* (New Haven 1990) 124.

⁽⁶⁾ For a critique of this primarily “sociological” view of “works of the law”, see WESTERHOLM, *Israel's Law*, 117-119; C. E. B. CRANFIELD, “‘The Works of the Law’ in the Epistle to the Romans”, *JSNT* 43 (1991) 89-101; also the thorough review given by M. BACHMANN, *Sünder oder Übertreter* (WUNT 59; Tübingen 1992) 91-100. In this matter the occurrence of the equivalent Hebrew phrase in the Qumran text (only recently come to light) known as 4QMMT is of decisive significance; the occurrence in 4QFlor 1.6-7 is less certain.

⁽⁷⁾ Cf. WESTERHOLM, *Israel's Law*, 113-116; also (on Rom 4,5), H. HÜBNER, *Law in Paul's Thought* (Edinburgh 1984) 118-124. Hübner moves, however, too far in the Bultmannian direction. The correct balance appears to me to be struck by D. ZELLER, “Der Zusammenhang von Gesetz und Sünde im Römerbrief”, *TZ* 38 (1982) 193-212, who, without embracing the full Bultmannian position on “boasting”, argues (against U. Wilckens and others) that the exclusion of the law way involves something more than factual failure to keep it on the part of sinful human beings; law and faith exclude each other *in principle* (cf. 204).

⁽⁸⁾ It is interesting that the Jewish Pauline scholar Alan Segal, who for obvious reasons admits the appeal of the Gaston-Gager thesis, points to this text as the place where that thesis founders: *Paul the Convert* 130-132, 334, n. 27; “Paul's Experience and Romans 9-11”, *Princeton Seminary Bulletin, Supplementary Issue, No. 1* (1991) (*The Church and Israel*) 56-70, esp. 62-67.

Paul here explores what coming to faith in the crucified Christ meant for Jewish-Christians such as Peter and himself. V. 15 records the former, pre-conversion attitude of superiority and disdain based on possession of the law. It functions concessively⁽⁹⁾ to bring out all the more forcefully the radical change of attitude that conversion entailed. Though we held, says Paul in effect, that clear sense of separateness from Gentile sinners based on possession of the law, *we too* (it is essential to bring out the intensive force of καὶ ἡμεῖς in v. 16; cf. ἡμεῖς, v. 15; καὶ αὐτοί, v. 17) came to see ourselves as sinners like the law-less Gentiles and so requiring a justification on a wholly other base than that of the law. The law way, its “uselessness” summed up in the (highly annotated) quotation from Ps 143,2, had to yield entirely to God’s gracious offer of justification for all—Jew as well as Gentile—on the basis of faith⁽¹⁰⁾.

Thesis: Paul’s Purpose in Writing to Rome

It is significant that at a turning point in Romans Paul clinches the matter by quoting again the same (annotated) text from Ps 143,2 that had carried the Jewish-Christian “conversion-conviction” recorded in Gal 2,16. At Rom 3,20 the prophetic denunciation that began at 1,18 is brought to a climactic conclusion with the statement (quoting the text in slightly extended form): “from works of law shall no flesh be justified before him”. Rom 1,18–3,20, in effect, represents simply an expansion or “unpacking” of the short summary contained in Gal 2,15–16 and I would argue that the record of Paul’s exchange with Peter at Antioch contained in this short text from Galatians provides an important clue for what Paul is about in Romans⁽¹¹⁾. As was the case with Peter, he is attempting to get the entire Christian community at Rome to embrace the full consequences of their coming to faith in Christ.

My thesis is that one can best explain the occasion and purpose of Romans on the supposition that a goodly portion of the community still clung to the law, not merely in a ritual or cultural sense, but as the means of obtaining justification at the coming judgement. They may not have owned this explicitly but it was there at least in attitude and unconscious motivation and led to serious disagreements with other members of the community who did not concede such a role to the law. What Paul is attempting is to get the community—more precisely the significant portion of it that still clung to the law (which doubtless included Gentile as well as

⁽⁹⁾ Cf. E. De W. BURTON, *The Epistle to the Galatians* (ICC; Edinburgh 1921) 119; H. SCHLIER, *Der Brief an die Galater* (MeyerK V; 5[14]th ed.; Göttingen 1971) 88; F. MUSSNER, *Der Galaterbrief* (HTKNT IX; Freiburg 1974) 167.

⁽¹⁰⁾ For the translation and interpretation of Gal 2,15–16 given here see B. BYRNE, ‘Sons of God’ – ‘Seed of Abraham’ (AnBib 83; Rome 1979) 143–147. The recent study of the passage by M. BACHMANN, *Sünder oder Übertreter* (see note 6 above) appears to adopt the same general line of interpretation.

⁽¹¹⁾ Cf. H. C. BEKER, *Paul the Apostle* (Edinburgh 1980) 79.

Jewish Christians)⁽¹²⁾—to let go of it once and for all. He requires this surrender in the interests, not simply of community unity, but of a far grander vision summed up eventually towards the end of the letter in 15,6: that of one eschatological people of God, made up of Jews and Gentiles, who with full mutual acceptance and equality (cf. v. 7), “together and with one voice glorify the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ”.

Over two decades ago G. Klein maintained that Paul intended his letter to Rome to function virtually as an act of evangelisation of a community which he held to lack a truly apostolic foundation⁽¹³⁾. More recently, from a sociological perspective, F. Watson has argued that Christianity in Rome was divided between two separate and mutually hostile congregations, a Jewish-Christian remnant of the foundation group and a Pauline Gentile Christian group; Paul writes to persuade the former to recognise the legitimacy of the latter, even though this will mean severing still existing ties with the Jewish synagogue⁽¹⁴⁾. Klein's thesis has not generally won favour; it hardly seems compatible with the tribute Paul pays the community in his epistolary prescript (1,8.12)⁽¹⁵⁾. Nonetheless, it seems to me, Klein was right at least in recognising the ambitiousness of the bid Paul was making in his letter. Likewise, while I do not believe that the letter bears evidence for so radical and simplistic a division among Christians in Rome as Watson appears to hold⁽¹⁶⁾, the thesis that Paul is aiming to get law-leaning Christians in Rome to let go of it once and for all in the cause of a deeper unity seems to me fundamentally correct. Beyond unity, however, I am arguing that Paul is in effect attempting to bring this significant community at Rome—which he has not founded, in which perhaps the majority are suspicious if not hostile towards him—within the scope of his own authority as apostle responsible for seeing the Gentile churches fitted properly into the wider vision of God's eschatological people outlined above.

⁽¹²⁾ The older assumption (cf. esp. F.C. Baur) that “Jewish Christian” meant law-observant and “Gentile Christian” meant law-free in the Pauline sense must now be seen as far too simplistic. Those whom Paul addresses in Rom 7,1, (“I speak to you who know the law”) are in all likelihood Gentile Christians zealous for the law and by the time of Paul's writing may well have made up the majority of the community. Correspondingly, there were Jewish Christians who adopted the Pauline position—notably Paul himself and others such as his friends and key collaborators the Jewish-Christian couple, Prisca and Aquila (cf. 16,3); cf. R. A. BROWN (with J. B. MEIER) *Antioch and Rome* (New York 1982) 1-6, 109; id., “Further Reflections on the Origins of the Church of Rome”, *The Conversation Continues: Studies in Paul and John* (In Honor of J. L. Martyn) (ed. R. T. FORTNA—B. R. GAVENTA) (Nashville 1990) 98-115, esp. pp. 98-99, 104; P. LAMPE, *Die städtrömischen Christen in den ersten beiden Jahrhunderten* (WUNT 2. 18; Tübingen 1987) 54-57.

⁽¹³⁾ German original 1969. English translation: “Paul's Purpose in Writing the Epistle to the Romans” in *Romans Debate*, 20-43; cf. esp. 41-42.

⁽¹⁴⁾ F. WATSON, *Paul, Judaism and the Gentiles* (SNTSMS 56; Cambridge 1986).

⁽¹⁵⁾ Cf. BROWN, *Antioch and Rome*, 115-116, n. 239.

⁽¹⁶⁾ Cf. W. S. CAMPBELL, “Did Paul Advocate Separation from the Synagogue? A Reaction to Francis Watson: *Paul, Judaism and the Gentiles: A Sociological Approach*”, *SJT* 42 (1989) 457-467.

Paul has set himself, then, an immense rhetorical task—one which explains, to my mind, the admission towards the end of having written, "rather boldly in part by way of reminder to you" (τολμηρότερον... ἀπὸ μέρους ὡς ἐπαναμνήσκων ὑμᾶς 15,15). That for the purpose he should employ a letter preliminary to a personal visit is perhaps not surprising at this mature stage of his ministry. In 2 Cor 10,10-11 he appears to agree with the taunt of adversaries that his letters carry more weight than his personal presence.

As in the case of other New Testament letters, the rhetorical aspect of Romans has, of course, been a fruitful object of recent study⁽¹⁷⁾. I do not propose to embark upon a strictly formal application of this method from the perspective of either ancient or modern rhetoric. I simply propose to derive from this approach its fundamental tenet that Paul's letters must be regarded as principally and above all instruments of persuasion rather than statements of theology. At the beginning of the letter, Paul casts himself in the role of the prophet proclaiming the "good news of God" (1,1-2; cf. the application of Isa 52,15 to his own mission in 15,20-21). It is within the rubric of a prophetic declamation that I believe Romans is principally to be seen as an instrument of persuasion.

Two Presuppositions

But before addressing the text of the letter more directly, it is appropriate to state a couple of more general presuppositions bound up with the thesis I am proposing.

1. The first concerns the foundation and orientation of the Christian community at Rome. I adhere to what appears to be the increasingly accepted view that the Christian community in Rome, the beginnings of which must go back to the early 40's at least, had strong links—probably founding links—with the community at Jerusalem and that the bulk of its members, including former Gentiles, remained deeply attached to the Jewish heritage⁽¹⁸⁾.

2. A further presupposition on my part is that Paul makes his play for the allegiance of the Roman community within a thoroughly apocalyptic perspective—a summons to imminent judgement—which he both presupposes, evokes and intensifies throughout the letter. Paul plays upon many emotions in Romans and not the least of them is that of fear—fear of condemnation at the impending judgment⁽¹⁹⁾. This is the backdrop to the

⁽¹⁷⁾ Cf. the survey of K. P. Donfried in *Romans Debate*, LVII-LXI and the articles by W. Wuellner, R. Jewett and D. E. Aune in the same volume.

⁽¹⁸⁾ Cf. W. WIEFEL, "The Jewish Community in Ancient Rome and the Origins of Roman Christianity", *Romans Debate*, 85-101, esp. 89; LAMPE, *Die städtrömischen Christen*, 58-61; BROWN, *Antioch and Rome*, 109-110; id., "Further Reflections" (see n. 12 above) 98-115; WEDDERBURN, *Reasons*, 50-54, 64-65.

⁽¹⁹⁾ On the abiding apocalyptic cast of Paul's thought see E. KÄSEMANN, "Primitive Christian Apocalyptic", *New Testament Questions of Today* (Philadelphia 1969) 108-137, esp. 131-137; BEKER, *Paul the Apostle* 143-149, 181; more recently, id., *Paul's Apocalyptic Gospel: The Coming Triumph of God* (Philadelphia 1982).

language of wrath, righteousness and justification. As preacher and pastor, Paul operates within a schema, shared with large parts of Judaism⁽²⁰⁾, that justification involves being found "righteous" at the judgement (Rom 2,3-16; 8,31-39; 2 Cor 5,10). As such it forms the essential precondition for salvation—for being rescued from the wrath (the negative aspect; cf. 5,10) and being brought into possession of 'eternal life' (the positive aspect; cf. 5,18; 6,20-23).

The Content of Romans

1. *The "Frames" of the Letter: 1,1-15 and 15,14-33*

It is generally conceded that the best clues to Paul's intention in writing to Rome are to be found in the "frames" to the letter: 1,1-15 and 15,14-33 (setting aside 16,1-26). The problem is, of course, that there is considerable discrepancy between the statements in these two sections⁽²¹⁾. Most notably, Paul gives no hint in the early part of the letter that his planned visit to Rome was to be preliminary to two further destinations: Jerusalem with the collection and Spain as a field of new missionary endeavour. Even within the exordium itself, across 1,11-14, Paul offers no less than four reasons for wanting to visit Rome: firstly (v.11), it is "to share some spiritual gift"; immediately (v.12) this is "corrected", in a tone of greater mutuality, as "being comforted through one and other's faith, yours and mine"; then (v.14) Paul recalls his long-standing, but always frustrated purpose to come to Rome in order that he "might gain some fruit among you as among the rest of the Gentiles"; finally (v.15) there is the simple statement of a purpose to "preach the gospel also to you in Rome".

This puzzling array is explainable once one recognises that in Rom 1,8-15 Paul's principal concern is to defend his *past* behaviour rather than to state his present intentions. Concerning the past, Paul is highly defensive⁽²²⁾. Introducing himself to Roman Christians, he knows he has to explain why, if he is as he insists (1,1.5.14; cf. 15,16.18-19) the apostle responsible to God for Gentiles, he has failed up till now to visit a community where they exist in considerable numbers. The very existence in the imperial capital of a significant group of Gentile Christians to all intents and purposes independent of Paul might, in fact, seem to cast doubt upon his unique charism. He must, then, explain that his apparent neglect of

⁽²⁰⁾ Cf., e.g., Tob 4,9-11; Jub 5,12-19; 1 Enoch 1,8-9; 38,1-6; 50,1-5; 100,4-10; 103,1-4; 4 Ezra 7,33-35.77-80.104-105; 2 Apoc. Bar. 24,1-2; 44,5-15; 51,1-16; 83,1-3; 84,11; Bib. Ant. 3,10; 44,10; Pss. Sol. 2,32-35; 9,4-5; 15,12-13; Sib. Or. 3,740; 4,40-45.

⁽²¹⁾ A discrepancy which led W. Schmithals to assign the sections to different documents within his view of Romans as a composite letter compiled by an editor out of several originally separate Pauline communications; cf. *Der Römerbrief als historisches Problem* (SNT 9; Gütersloh 1975). For a critique of Schmithals see A. J. M. WEDDERBURN, "The Purpose and Occasion of Romans Again", *Romans Debate*, 195-202.

⁽²²⁾ Cf. U. WILCKENS, *Der Brief an die Römer (Röm 1-5)* (EKKNT VI/1; Zürich-Neukirchen 1978) 79-80.

Rome in no way implied weakness or lack of concern on his part for the Roman Christians. They have been on his mind and in his prayers all along (vv. 9-10). If he has not come to them up till now, it is simply because he has been prevented (v.13). His sense of "obligation", as apostle, to "Greeks and barbarians, learned and unlearned" (v.14) stands firm; encompassed within it has been a long-standing desire to proclaim the gospel also in Rome (v.15)⁽²³⁾.

At this point (1,15), however, Paul remains content with expressing his basic concern for the Roman community. He does not reveal his intention to visit Rome in the near future, let alone his plans for a wider apostolate further West. The matter is very delicate and not merely the visit but even its announcement must be prepared for with great care. Paul cannot pass through Rome a "private citizen", so to speak, just another fellow believer. He must come as "apostle to the Gentiles" or not at all. In particular, he could not ignore or leave untouched and uncorrected there a community situation not in conformity with his view of the gospel and, as soon becomes clear, he has good reason to believe that continuing adherence to the law is causing problems in this regard.

Hence any announcement of a visit will come only after a forceful and effective appeal to the community to conform in every way to the true pattern of the gospel. This prophetic appeal makes up the body of the letter: 1,18-15,13. After they have heard it, the community, Paul hopes, will be significantly changed, their conversion to the gospel fully deepened. They will not, in effect, be "in the same place" at 15,14 as they are in 1,15. They will be radically held within the grasp of the gospel powerfully and "boldly" expounded in the great mass of material intervening. They will be ready to hear Paul's plans (15,23-32), ultimately to receive him in person and support his mission. Paul will have achieved his (doubtless long-cherished) aim of bringing this significant church within the ambit of his authority and eschatological vision.

2. *The Prophetic Accusation: 1,16-17; 1,18-3,20*

Paul begins his prophetic declamation boldly asserting that he is "not ashamed of the gospel" (v.16a). The overall apocalyptic cast of Paul's gospel suggests that this avowal be interpreted in an eschatological sense⁽²⁴⁾ and seen in the light of the positive antithesis that follows: that the gospel is the power of God unto salvation for all believers (v.16b). Paul means that the gospel is not "something weak" in the sense that it will let you down at the crucial moment—the crucial moment in this case, within the overall apocalyptic perspective, being the day of judgement. Paul is

⁽²³⁾ The expression of Paul's intention, τὸ κατ' ἐμὲ πρόθυμον in v.15a, lacks a verb and hence its temporal specification remains open. It is best related to the past; cf. D. ZELLER, *Der Brief an die Römer* (RNT; Regensburg 1985) 41; earlier, M. KETTUNEN, *Der Abfassungszweck des Römerbriefes* (Helsinki 1979) 125-138.

⁽²⁴⁾ Cf. G. HEROLD, *Zorn und Gerechtigkeit bei Paulus* (Bern 1973) 28-141, 228-229, 241-242; C. K. BARRETT, "I Am Not Ashamed of the Gospel", *New Testament Essays* (London 1972) 116-143.

asserting that the gospel adhered to by faith, and this way alone (the polemic against the rival way is already implicit), will truly suffice for salvation at the day of judgement. Why? Because those who adhere to the gospel by faith will be clad, through the divine creative power exercised in Christ, with the required eschatological righteousness⁽²⁵⁾.

At this point (1,18) Paul evokes the terrifying prospect of the eschatological wrath of God and begins a long prophetic "accusation" that comes to term only with the conclusion enunciated in 3,20. Why, writing to those who are already believers, does Paul unroll this long demonstration, or accusation, that all are "under the power of sin"? To respond effectively to this question we must note that, while Paul is at pains to assert the divine impartiality in judgement (2,11) and is out to "convict" the entire world of sin (3,9; cf. v.23), the stress falls particularly upon the Jewish world⁽²⁶⁾. All hinges upon the sharp accusation to the "judger" launched at 2,1. The preliminary indictment of the Gentile world is something that can be taken for granted as indicating a standard Jewish view—precisely that summed up in Gal 2,15: "We are Jews by birth and not Gentile sinners". With his (Jewish or Jewish-sympathetic) readers hooked on this conventional complacency, Paul at 2,1 springs his trap: you who judge do the same and lie open to the same condemnation.

The "accusation" that unfolds, then, in the rest of chapter 2 is all designed to lead to the conclusion summed up in 3,20: "from works of law shall no flesh be justified before God". At considerable length, Paul is rehearsing for the Romans the same argument that he summed up so briefly for the Galatians in 2,16, recounting the reminder he had given to Cephas concerning what was at stake in their Jewish-Christian "conversion-conviction": "...knowing that a person is not justified from works of the law, but through faith in Christ,...". Though bristling with exegetical difficulties at every point, the overall logic is inevitable and clear: at the eschatological judgement justification will be by works (2,6-16); (Jewish) possession of the law will not avail since the law is frustrated by human sin, which is universal (2,17-29; 3,9); the conclusion—unquestionable because it is also God's conclusion, as Scripture attests (3,10-18)—is that the law is useless for justification; in fact, it brings "knowledge of sin" (3,20b).

⁽²⁵⁾ While some instances of "the righteousness of God" in Romans clearly connote *God's own* righteousness (3,5; cf. 3,26: εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν δίκαιον), it is equally clear that in other places the phrase has reference also to the eschatological righteousness conferred or to be conferred on *human beings* as a result of God's righteous action; the clear implication of human righteousness in the Habakkuk quotation in v.17 ensures that the phrase has at least a bi-polar reference in v.16, as must also be the case across 3,21-26; also 10,1-10; cf. ZELLER, *Römer*, 45-50.

⁽²⁶⁾ Cf. G. BORNKAMM, "Gesetz und Natur: Röm 2:14-16", *Studien zu Antike und Urchristentum. Gesammelte Aufsätze Band II* (Munich 1959) 93-118, esp. p.94; BEKER, *Paul the Apostle*, 79-81; SYNOFZIK, *Gerichts- und Vergeltungsaussagen*, 87-88; DUNN, *Romans 1-8*, 51. The necessity Paul feels to handle, in 3,1-8, objections arising specifically out of his apparent derogation of the Jewish privilege confirms this interpretation of the argument across 1,18-3,20.

3. *God's Saving Action in Christ: Righteousness through Faith: 3,21-31*

At this point of his prophetic declamation (3,20) Paul has brought his readers, *including those who would still cling to the law for eschatological security*, face to face with the fearful prospect of being delivered up to God's wrath (cf. 1,18). Only execution of the sentence would appear to be outstanding. Instead, however, Paul springs upon his audience a dramatic and surprising change, introducing God's saving intervention in Christ (3,21-26)⁽²⁷⁾. In the face of universal human sin and lack of righteousness, God has acted creatively in Christ to remove the alienating burden of sin and provide, for all believers, Jew and Gentile, the required eschatological righteousness.

Theological interest over the ages has understandably focussed on the redemption statement in 3,24-26, which relates the operation of God's righteousness to the shedding of Christ's blood in his death. But Paul actually arrives at his chief conclusion in the short passage that follows (3,27-30): the faith way, responding to God's righteousness, has completely eliminated the discredited and useless "works of law" way—and this has allowed for equal status of Jews and Gentiles in making up the one eschatological people of the one God of the world.

4. *Continuing Preoccupation with the Law*

But the law, of course, cannot be swept aside so easily. Paul allows the obvious objection to arise at this point (3,31): "Are we doing away with the law through faith?" (31a). How and where precisely he buttresses his firm denial (31b) that this is the case has long been a matter of discussion⁽²⁸⁾. He certainly *begins* to do so in the scriptural reflection upon Abraham that opens up immediately in chapter 4. Just as the exclusion of the possibility of a righteousness on the basis of law had been clinched by appeal to God's view recorded in scripture in 3,10-20, so, on the positive side, there is a corresponding scriptural (and hence divine) attestation of the faith-way in 4,1-25.

But Paul is not finished with the law at 4,25. The objection and response concerning the law at 3,31 continues to be the springboard of his argument for much of what follows—something which accounts for the continuing reappearance of νόμος throughout the letter: 4,13.14.15.16; 5,13.20; 6,14.15; 7,1-25; 8,2-4.7; 9,31; 10,4-5; 13,8 (cf. ἐξ ἔργων: 9,12.32; 11,6). Paul never loses sight of the fact that he has to explain the role of the law while at the same time continuing to maintain very firmly that it has no further role in the attainment of salvation.

⁽²⁷⁾ Cf. J.-N. ALETTI, "Rm 1,18-3,20: Incohérence ou cohérence de l'argumentation paulinienne?", *Bib* 69 (1988) 47-62, esp. p. 61.

⁽²⁸⁾ Cf. C. T. RHYNE, *Faith Establishes the Law* (SBLDS 55; Chico, CA 1981) 25-31.

5. "No Condemnation": Romans 5-8

At this point I should like to dwell for some time upon the section of Romans comprising chapters 5-8. While it has long been recognised that the material they contain forms a unified block⁽²⁹⁾, the precise role of the section within the letter is not all that clear⁽³⁰⁾.

I would argue that this section of Romans can be seen as equally central to the argument, provided the apocalyptic perspective is kept in mind. True, Paul speaks at the start of believers being justified and so having "peace with God" and "access to the grace in which we now stand" (5,1-2). But, somewhat startlingly in view of this, he can still speak in v.9 of "being saved from the wrath" and the stirring concluding section, 8,31-39, powerfully evokes the great eschatological assize. Moreover, at the beginning of chapter 8 we hear the forensic language of condemnation—even though Paul is asserting that its threat is removed "for those who are in Christ Jesus" (v. 1).

The chief burden of chapters 5-8 is to address the complex eschatological situation in which believers now stand: justified and fundamentally at peace with God (5,1-2), as attested by the Spirit (5,5; 8,14-17), yet still on the way to salvation (8,24-25), the final judgement yet to be brought in (8,31-39). In this context, where believers feel in their mortal bodies the continuing buffets of the present unredeemed age (8,23), Paul is at pains to assert the reality of the new relationship with God and the sure hope of the final bodily conformity to the glorious existence of the risen Lord (8,29-30)⁽³¹⁾.

This complex eschatological pattern makes considerable demands upon Paul in terms of giving a rationale for Christian living (ethics) in this curious time when the old and the new age overlap. Those whom Paul is addressing in Romans are presumably saying, "Because the judgement lies ahead, we must still practise the law in order to be found righteous; otherwise we shall be accounted as sinners and face God's wrath". The whole burden of the central "ethical" section of Romans 5-8, namely

⁽²⁹⁾ Cf. esp. N.A. DAHL, "Two Notes on Romans 5", *ST* 5 (1951) 37-48; BYRNE, 'Sons of God', 85; id., "Living Out the Righteousness of God", *CBQ* 43 (1981) 557-581, esp. 559-560; R. JEWETT, "Following the Argument of Romans", *Romans Debate*, 265-277, esp. 271-273. The outstanding recent exception to what otherwise seems to be a modern consensus in placing a major break between 4,25 and 5,1 is represented by U. WILCKENS, *Römer 1-5*, 17, 181-182, 286-288.

⁽³⁰⁾ In a 1976 study R. Scroggs argued that this section and the one following (chapters 9-11) comprised two homilies originally independent of the context of Romans: "Paul as Rhetorician: Two Homilies in Romans 1-11", *Jews, Greeks and Christians: Essays in Honor of William David Davies* (ed. R. HAMERTON-KELLY-R. SCROGGS) (SJLA 21; Leiden 1976) 272-298. Wedderburn's discussion (*Reasons*, 130-136) of chapters 5-8 appears to me to be one of the more laboured and less convincing sections of his work. Jewett's view of the section ("Following the Argument", 273-274) as constituting in rhetorical terms an *ornatio* "dealing with a series of implications and objections to the doctrine of the righteousness of God" hardly does justice to the forward movement of Paul's argument at this stage of the letter.

⁽³¹⁾ Cf. BYRNE, 'Sons of God', 115-122.

6,1–8,13, is dedicated to addressing this preoccupation⁽³²⁾. Paul, in fact, meets it head on—moving almost immediately from the defensive over to the offensive. Believers in Christ have been removed from the law (6,14–15; 7,4.6). That removal is not the problem—in fact, it is the solution (6,14)! Why? Because the law had become from the outset the inevitable ally and tool of sin (7,5.7–24,8,3a). Whereas “in Christ”, life in the Spirit, sets believers free from the captivity of sin in the flesh (8,2–4) and thus provides the possibility of having the required eschatological righteousness. So that “there is now no condemnation for those in Christ Jesus” (8,1); “while the body may be mortal because of sin, the Spirit means (eternal) life because of righteousness” (τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ζωὴ διὰ δικαιοσύνην, 8,10b)⁽³³⁾.

The swift and passing review of Romans 5–8 offered here has aimed to show how this section addresses what I have argued is Paul’s major concern in the letter: to persuade the Christians of Rome who cling to the law to let go of it in the interests of a deeper conversion to Christ and ultimately of the unity of the eschatological people of God. Within the framework of his “overlap of the ages” eschatology, Paul has insisted that the law—at least if practised for purposes of obtaining eschatological righteousness—is of no avail; in a deadly sense it is, in fact, the very reverse. Paul has, therefore, frightened his hearers by reminding them of the prospect of judgement (1,18), frightened them yet more by pointing out that what they might have hoped to rely upon, the law, was of no avail in that cause (2,1–3,20), and then pointed to the fact that the gospel gives all that is necessary for salvation (3,21–8,39) and is therefore nothing of which to be ashamed (cf. 1,17).

6. *Romans 9–11; 12–14*

To draw the remaining parts of Romans into this scheme is, within the scope of this paper, possible in only the most general way. In Chapters 9–11 Paul addresses the bitter problem of unbelieving Israel in a way that is sensitive to the Jewish sympathies of his audience. Nonetheless, he points unequivocally to wrong-headed zeal for the law as the nub of the problem. Israel, zealous for law-righteousness, has stumbled at the rock of God’s righteousness coming in the shape of the crucified Lord (9,30–33; cf. 1 Cor 1,23). Christ, in a word, is simply the “end” of the law for every believer (10,5)⁽³⁴⁾.

⁽³²⁾ Cf. BYRNE, “Living Out the Righteousness of God”, 562–570. The false conclusion drawn in Gal 2,17b, “Is Christ, then, a minister of sin?”, represents the same kind of problem. In both places, Gal 2,17 and Rom 6,1 Paul, in diatribe style, lets come to the surface the false conclusion that his view of the Christian life involves sin, in order to drive forward his argument with the vigorous answering “God forbid!”.

⁽³³⁾ For fuller elaboration of this interpretation of Rom 8,1–13 see BYRNE, “Living Out the Righteousness of God” 567–570; more popularly, id., *Reckoning with Romans* (Wilmington 1986) 148–159.

⁽³⁴⁾ While τέλος can undoubtedly have the sense of “fulfilment”, “goal”, the simple meaning “end” suits the negative tone adhering to νόμος here (cf. esp. the contrast between the “law” and the “faith” ways continuing in the verses im-

At the beginning of the paranesis (chapters 12,1-15,13) Paul enjoins upon the Romans "a spiritual worship" consisting in the offering of their bodies as a "living sacrifice to God" (12,1); he requires that they conform not to this (present) world but undergo a total renewal of mind (12,2). This exhortation, though seemingly general at first sight, can well be taken as another way of saying, "Realise the depth of your conversion; accept that you are truly part of a new world coming into being, where there is no place for clinging to aspects of the old world such as the law"⁽³⁵⁾. Later (13,8-10), to counter, rhetorically, any lingering hankering after the law, Paul suggests that love is the fulfilment of the law (cf. Gal 5,14).

In the more specific paranesis given in chapter 14 the "Strong" are presumably those who, like Paul, held all foods to be available, while the "Weak" would be those who clung more scrupulously to the prescriptions of the law⁽³⁶⁾. The tolerance of the "weak" that Paul now recommends cannot be in any sense an acceptance of the validity of the law for justification. It is simply a matter of allowing the brother or sister of weak conscience to continue in a ritual sense the practice with which they are comfortable. Far from re-erecting barriers of division, as in the food controversy at Antioch, as recorded in Galatians 2, here the tolerance is all directed to Paul's central overall design for the community: "that together with one voice they may glorify the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ" (15,6) and so fulfil the plan for God's eschatological people as promised in the scriptures (vv. 7-13).

7. *Paul's Plans: Rom 15,14-33*

We have cast a rapid eye across Paul's prophetic appeal making up the body of his letter to Rome (1,18-15,13). The concluding "frame" of the letter, 15,14-33, we have already considered to some extent. Here Paul acknowledges the boldness of what he has written (15,15a), justifying it on the basis of an account of his apostolic charism in richly symbolic terms derived from the language of cult. He presents himself as "a minister of Christ Jesus for the Gentiles, carrying out a priestly duty with respect to the gospel of God, so that the offering (consisting) of the Gentiles might be

mediately following) and is more agreeable with Paul's wider thought (esp. Gal 3,23-25; 2Cor 3,13). For comprehensive bibliography and survey of the vast scholarly debate on the matter see DUNN, *Romans 9-16*, 578 (Bibliography), 589-590 (discussion); also RHYNE, *Faith Establishes the Law*, 95-116 (arguing for the "fulfilment" sense).

⁽³⁵⁾ It is significant that in Phil 3,3, at the beginning of a severe polemic against Judaisers affecting the Philippian community, Paul speaks of believers as "the (true) circumcision, who worship (λατρεύοντες) God in the Spirit". On the application of Romans 12-13 to the concrete situation of a community split over allegiance to the Jewish law, see WEDDERBURN, *Reasons*, 75-81.

⁽³⁶⁾ As Paul describes the position of the "Weak" in vv. 2-5.22, they actually go beyond the prescriptions of the law in abstaining from all meat and also from wine. But this may have been considered necessary by strict Jews (and Gentile converts) living in a hostile Gentile environment; cf. WATSON, *Paul, Judaism and the Gentiles*, 94-96.

acceptable, sanctified through the Holy Spirit” (vv. 15b-16). It is the intense fulfilment of this charge in the East which has prevented him from coming to Rome, up till now (vv. 17-22)⁽³⁷⁾.

The statement of intent to visit Rome which now follows at long last (vv. 23-24) is thus set within this impressive context of an apostolic career in full bloom and arrived at a key turning point in which the Roman community can now share. Preliminary to the visit is Paul’s journey to Jerusalem with the collection (vv. 25-27). The hoped for acceptance of this by the mother church (v.31b) will be the most potent enactment of Paul’s vision of the eschatological Israel made up of Gentiles and the faithful Jewish remnant.

Here, then, is the climax of Paul’s bid to draw the Roman community into his wider vision. If he can win such a significant Christian community to this view and this allegiance, that will be a good harbinger—and perhaps, in view of the traditional ties between Rome and Jerusalem, a facilitator—of the unity of the total church. Made up of Jewish and Gentile believers, the Roman Christians can, when purged of divisive attachment to the law, form in their mutual acceptance and common praise of God (15,6-7) a microcosm of the entire world-wide church. Paul will have performed his “priestly duty with respect to the gospel of God” (15,16). He will also have eliminated the increasingly glaring “exception” to his responsibility for the Gentiles constituted by this significant church standing at the crossroads of the Eastern and the (projected) Western fields of his apostolic mission.

Conclusion

Hence the boldness of the throw Paul is making in the shape of this letter. In Rome, as elsewhere, he saw the great barrier to the realisation of his vision and his responsibility to consist in the clinging to the law on the part of certain Jewish Christians and those of pagan background who had come under their sway. While a purely customary retention of a law-practising way of life may not have caused trouble, what did stir depths and produce the divisive attitude to the Gentiles was the sense that the law was still necessary for salvation. It was this attitude which Paul was determined to eradicate as totally at odds with the Christian gospel. Writing more diplomatically to Rome, he does not state this truth as bluntly and explicitly as he does in Galatians. Instead, with great rhetorical force he plays upon a whole gamut of religious emotions: he plumbs the depth of the fear that inspires the clinging to the law; he shatters any grounds for

⁽³⁷⁾ Paul here spells out what lies behind the simple excuse “because I have been prevented” given in 1,13. It has been total involvement in his God-impelled mission in the East (“from Jerusalem as far round as Illyricum” [v.19]), rather than strict adherence to the policy of not building on another’s foundation (cf. vv. 20-21), that has chiefly hindered his coming to Rome (that is, taking v.22 as referring not just to vv. 20-21 but to the description of apostolic activity beginning in v. 17; cf. CRANFIELD, *Romans*, II, 765-766; DUNN, *Romans* 9-16, 871).

confidence on this basis; he asserts firmly the sufficient and sure hope of salvation that God's work in Christ holds out for all believers; and, finally, as apostle responsible for the due incorporation of the Gentiles into God's eschatological people, he summons the community to enter fully into the way of life appropriate to this hope.

Jesuit Theological College
175 Royal Parade
Parkville, Victoria 3052
Australia

Brendan BYRNE

RES BIBLIOGRAPHICAE

Davies–Allison et le retour de Matthieu⁽¹⁾

Après une période de latence relative, la dernière décennie a vu se multiplier les commentaires de saint Matthieu. Aussi l'une des premières questions venant spontanément à l'esprit à propos de celui de Davies–Allison que nous présentons ici est la suivante: qu'apporte-t-il de particulier? Un rapprochement avec deux des plus importants parus ces dernières années: celui de Gnilka dont le tome 2 a d'ailleurs été recensé dans cette revue par Allison lui-même⁽²⁾ et celui de Luz qui aujourd'hui marque incontestablement l'exégèse du premier évangile⁽³⁾, conduit à se remémorer la fameuse trilogie jérémienne du prêtre, du prophète et du sage (Jr 18,18). Passons vite sur la part d'approximation qu'il y a à rapprocher le commentaire de Gnilka de l'instruction du prêtre. Mais on reconnaîtra déjà plus volontiers une saveur prophétique à celui de Luz. Quant à celui de Davies–Allison, nul n'éprouvera de réticences, croyons-nous, à le rapprocher du propos du sage, lucide et sans passion. C'est même, d'une certaine façon, la place que ces auteurs revendiquent lorsqu'ils déclarent que «leur visée a été d'être fidèle à la tradition d'une étude exégétique désintéressée et objective» (XI). Notre sentiment est qu'ils ont su faire les choix nécessaires pour atteindre cet objectif. Le monumental commentaire de Matthieu qu'ils nous offrent a tout pour devenir un «classique». Qu'on en juge déjà au contenu du premier des trois volumes annoncés: une imposante bibliographie générale, à nette dominante anglo-saxonne et germanique, de plus de 700 titres (XXI–XLVII); une introduction de quelque 148 pages, à elle seule véritable petit traité sur le premier évangile; le commentaire cursif sur près de 600 pages de Mt 1,1–7,29 subdivisé en seize parties. Y sont insérés quatre excursus sur les sources de Mt 1,18–2,23, les béatitudes, les antithèses et le Notre Père.

Devant une telle abondance de biens, le recenseur se doit inévitablement de choisir. Etant donné son importance pour saisir les orientations générales du commentaire, nos réflexions partiront essentiellement de l'introduction subdivisée en huit parties, les exemples choisis renvoyant, quant à eux, de façon préférentielle, à des passages situés en Mt 1,1–7,29.

⁽¹⁾ W. D. DAVIES–D. C. ALLISON, *The Gospel according to Saint Matthew*. Volume 1: Introduction and Commentary on Matthew I–VII (The International Critical Commentary). Edinburgh, T & T Clark, 1988. XLVII–731 p. £27,50.

⁽²⁾ J. GNILKA, *Das Matthäusevangelium*. 1 Teil (HTKNT I/1; Freiburg–Basel–Wien 1986). 2 Teil (HTKNT I/2; Freiburg–Basel–Wien 1988). Recension de D. C. ALLISON, «Gnilka on Matthew», *Bib* 70 (1989) 526–538.

⁽³⁾ U. LUZ, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus*. 1 Teil (EKKNT I/1; Zürich–Neukirchen–Vluyn 1985). 2 Teil (EKKNT I/2; Zürich–Neukirchen–Vluyn 1990).

1. Méthodologie. Dominance sans exclusive de l'approche historico-critique classique: un texte n'est pas seulement un jeu de structures produisant du sens à l'intérieur de sa clôture; mais il a et même il *est* son histoire; surtout, le récit de Matthieu présuppose la figure historique de Jésus comme sa raison d'être.

2. Auteur. L'auteur du premier évangile était un membre du peuple juif. Matthieu, qui connaissait l'hébreu, vivait, semble-t-il, dans un milieu bilingue, voire trilingue.

3. Plan. On connaissait les franches réserves de Davies vis-à-vis du plan quinquapartite de Matthieu sur le modèle du Pentateuque, proposé par Bacon. On ne s'étonne pas de les retrouver ici. Mais, aucune solution de rechange ne s'imposant vraiment aujourd'hui, Davies-Allison en restent sur ce point à des constats d'ordre général qui ne permettent pas de dégager un véritable plan de Matthieu: cinq grands discours dans le premier évangile; alternance régulière de ceux-ci avec les sections narratives; à partir de Mt 14,1, Matthieu suit le plan de Marc; jusqu'en Mt 12 et dans les grands discours, c'est-à-dire là où il compose de lui-même, le rédacteur matthéen rédige en ayant systématiquement recours au procédé de la composition par triades.

4. Caractéristiques littéraires. Une reprise attentive du dossier à l'école des «classiques» (Allen, Hawkins) conduit Davies-Allison apparemment plus loin que ne l'avait fait la recherche du plan de Matthieu. L'emploi constant de procédés tels que l'anticipation, la répétition, l'inclusion, comme la dissémination régulière de la plupart des caractéristiques sur l'ensemble de l'évangile plaident nettement en faveur de l'unité littéraire de celui-ci; manifestement, c'est la main du même homme qui est à l'œuvre de bout en bout. Par ailleurs, si le grec de Matthieu atteste que celui-ci était une personne instruite possédant une solide maîtrise de cette langue, cela n'implique pas nécessairement que c'était sa langue maternelle. L'usage rédactionnel répété de procédés comme le chiasme, l'inclusion, les constructions de type numérique, les répétitions (doublets, triplets), les sémitismes et septuagintismes sont en effet des signes difficilement contournables d'un esprit qui baigne manifestement dans la tradition juive et rabbinique. Une conclusion qui précise ce qui avait été précédemment dit sur la personnalité de l'auteur du premier évangile.

5. Sources de Matthieu. L'alternative de la priorité de Matthieu sur Marc ayant été successivement placée au rang de solution à prendre en considération, puis d'hypothèse à écarter, Davies-Allison se présentent comme des partisans sereins de la théorie des Deux-Sources. Les accords mineurs Matthieu/Luc contre Marc ne remettent pas en cause la priorité de ce dernier. La *Redenquelle* est un document écrit, que Matthieu et Luc ont pu connaître *en grec* sous deux formes légèrement différentes; mais Davies-Allison n'abusent pas de la distinction Q^{Mt} et Q^{Lc} (*). Quant au bien par-

(*) Ils y recourent toutefois pour expliquer les versions matthéenne et lucanienne des Béatitudes (435-436). Pour le Notre Père, ils demeurent plus hésitants (590-592).

ticulier de Matthieu (M), il est très largement rédactionnel. Néanmoins, dans les sept premiers chapitres, Mt 1,18–2,23 reproduit sans doute un récit pré-matthéen (190-195); il y aurait également un regroupement pré-matthéen, distinct de Q, derrière les antithèses primaires de Mt 5,21-24.27-28.33-37 (504-505), ainsi qu'une *didaché* cultuelle pré-matthéenne derrière Mt 6,1-6.16-18.

6. Date de rédaction. Entre 80 et 95, dans un contexte polémique qui nous renvoie l'écho de l'effort de restructuration juive de Jamnia. Il n'est cependant pas possible de préciser si cette rédaction date d'avant ou d'après la promulgation de la *birkat ha-Minim*.

7. Lieu de composition. Le meilleur candidat reste Antioche; mais ce n'est que la meilleure conjecture de l'exégèse du moment.

8. Texte grec de référence: NA²⁶, Huck–Greeven 1981 (HG) et occasionnellement GNT².

Cette présentation rapide permet de se rendre immédiatement compte du caractère « sage » et modéré des orientations majeures du commentaire de Davies–Allison sur Matthieu. Ce trait se manifeste aussi par le ton choisi pour rédiger l'ouvrage: on sent des auteurs davantage animés par le désir de définir le champ d'une discussion raisonnable entre gens de bonne compagnie que par celui d'imposer une solution. De ce point de vue, le présent commentaire constitue un véritable bilan, prudent et très documenté, de la recherche actuelle sur le premier évangile; il sera difficile d'en faire l'économie. Cependant, dame Sagesse sachant elle-même se faire prophétesse, il nous semble aussi invitation discrète à aller, à ses risques et périls, un peu plus avant dans ses analyses et ses conclusions. C'est à cette invitation que nous voudrions répondre sur les trois points suivants: l'auteur du premier évangile, le lieu de composition et le mouvement narratif d'ensemble de celui-ci.

1. L'auteur du premier évangile. Le portrait qui nous en est offert ne manque pas de couleur; peut-on le préciser encore un peu? Il nous le semble.

Prenons le dossier linguistique, un de ceux où Davies–Allison se séparent le plus de Luz⁽⁵⁾. Incontestablement, nos auteurs ont tendance à accentuer la dimension « juive » du premier évangile et, par voie de conséquence, à en minimiser la coloration grecque. Révélatrice à cet égard, leur valorisation des parallèles juifs et rabbiniques de Matthieu, comme celle de ses sémitismes rédactionnels (80-85). N'est pas relevé en revanche l'emploi, également rédactionnel, de termes techniques du langage chrétien hellénistique comme *παλιγγενέσια* (Mt 19,28) et sans doute *παρουσία*, une caractéristique matthéenne de Hawkins (4/0/0). On pourrait également signaler que l'usage rédactionnel, dans le texte grec de Matthieu, de figures de style comme l'accusatif interne (Mt 2,10; 14,1; 22,3.11) ou la paronomase (Mt

(5) LUZ, *Matthäusevangelium 1*: L'évangéliste ne connaissait probablement pas l'hébreu, ni l'araméen. « La seule chose sûre est que sa langue maternelle est le grec » (63).

21,42; 22,9) ne déplaît pas à un helléniste. Concrètement nous ne trancherons pas la question de la langue maternelle de Matthieu; les moyens nous manquent pour le faire. Mais nous sommes prêt à croire que la langue la plus usuelle de Matthieu, au moment où il écrivait son évangile, était le grec. Nous en voyons un indice dans le «manque de particularités» du grec matthéen; nous ne trouvons pas chez lui ce mélange de tournures incorrectes ou approximatives et d'expressions recherchées, voire de purismes, que nous avons par exemple chez Marc⁽⁶⁾, souvent la marque d'une langue apprise sur le tard ou irrégulièrement pratiquée. Il nous semble également pouvoir écrire que le rédacteur matthéen s'adresse à une communauté chrétienne, sans doute judéo-chrétienne dans son fond, mais qui possède une tradition culturelle grecque: pensons au Notre Père, au formulaire d'institution (Mt 26,26-28), à la présence rédactionnelle chez Matthieu d'invocations à la connotation culturelle peu contestable comme κύριε σῶσον (Mt 8,25; 14,30), κύριε ἐλέησον (Mt 15,22; 17,15; 20,30.31).

Ces quelques remarques faites, nous pensons cependant que Davies-Allison soutiennent très justement le bilinguisme, voire le trilinguisme du rédacteur du premier évangile. La conclusion proposée a selon nous le mérite d'écarter le concept trop facile de «grec synagoga», en fait vide de sens tant qu'on ne peut présenter un corpus caractérisé de textes relevant de cette catégorie. Nous nous permettrons seulement de prolonger les conclusions de nos auteurs par les deux remarques suivantes. Tout d'abord la simple lecture des sémitismes rédactionnels de Matthieu relevés (80-85)⁽⁷⁾ permet de constater qu'il s'agit dans la plupart des cas d'hébraïsmes, alors que chez lui les aramaïsmes sont en régression par rapport à Marc (19-21). Cette relative désaffection de Matthieu pour les aramaïsmes au bénéfice des hébraïsmes se retrouve dans les écrits rabbiniques où l'hébreu est très largement dominant, mais toutefois sans que disparaisse complètement l'usage de l'araméen. Ensuite, plus que Davies-Allison, nous sommes sensible au fait que parmi les expressions sémitisantes caractéristiques de Matthieu, certaines et non des moindres comme ὁ πατήρ... ὁ ἐν (τοῖς) οὐρανοῖς (13/1/0) ou ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν (32/0/0) ne voient apparaître leur équivalent sémitique dans la littérature juive qu'un demi-siècle après l'activité de Jésus et en lien avec la personne de Johanan ben Zakkai. Cela rejoint bien sûr les remarques de nos auteurs sur la citation rédactionnelle d'Os 6,6 en Mt 9,13 et 12,7 et sur l'emploi, également rédactionnel, du titre de rabbi en Mt 23,8⁽⁸⁾. Cela explique aussi pourquoi nous sommes moins hésitant qu'eux à voir

⁽⁶⁾ Les incorrections grammaticales de Marc sont connues. Pour ses «purismes», cf. G. CLAUDEL, *La Confession de Pierre. Trajectoire d'une péripécie évangélique* (EB; Paris 1988) 203 et 252. Depuis la lecture de Davies-Allison (105-106), nous y ajoutons l'emploi marcier de mots grecs rares, auxquels Matthieu substitue des termes ou des expressions plus courantes.

⁽⁷⁾ La liste est peut-être à compléter. Si Mt 16,17 est rédactionnel, le σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα de ce verset est également à compter parmi les hébraïsmes rédactionnels de Matthieu. On pensera aussi aux οἱ πτωχοὶ τοῦ πνεύματος de Mt 5,3; cf. IQM 14,7.

⁽⁸⁾ Malgré l'accueil souvent favorable de la critique, nous sommes en revanche plus hésitant à retrouver les trois piliers de Siméon le Juste derrière la division tripartite du Sermon sur la Montagne.

derrière le rédacteur de Matthieu un scribe juif converti, qui a continué à fréquenter les cercles de scribes juifs plusieurs décennies encore après la fin de l'activité terrestre de Jésus. Pour ce scribe à la croisée des chemins, ce choix repose sur la conviction qu'en «Jésus de Nazareth, le Fils de Dieu», s'accomplit la justice de Dieu (Mt 3,15), la Loi et les Prophètes (Mt 5,17). Quant à l'alternative pharisienne, aujourd'hui largement dominante dans le monde juif, elle n'est qu'imposture, laissant en fait les foules harassées et prostrées comme des brebis sans berger (Mt 9,36).

A l'appui de ces propos, nous produisons les deux arguments complémentaires suivants:

a. L'argument, classique, de la signature de Mt 13,52 placée, ajoutons-nous, à un endroit particulièrement significatif du premier évangile: au moment où manifestement le rédacteur de celui-ci va quitter sa phase de plus grande créativité organisationnelle (le neuf?) pour retrouver la suite marcienne des péripécies (l'ancien?).

b. L'argument de l'attitude du Jésus matthéen vis-à-vis des autorités juives. Nous rejoignons tout-à-fait Davies-Allison, lorsqu'ils écrivent qu'il n'y a pas chez Matthieu de rejet total et définitif du peuple juif et que l'animosité du premier évangile n'est pas dirigée contre celui-ci dans son ensemble, mais contre ses seuls leaders (23-24)⁽⁹⁾. Nous précisons simplement: autrement dit contre les seuls scribes pharisiens. Nous avons déjà eu l'occasion de dire que nous partagions les conclusions de Orton sur ce point⁽¹⁰⁾. Dans le même sens et en nous rappelant ce que nous venons de dire sur le grec de Marc amélioré par Matthieu, nous pouvons comparer l'animosité marcienne vis-à-vis des scribes venus de Jérusalem (Mc 3,22; 7,1)⁽¹¹⁾ à la rude animosité matthéenne du scribe devenu disciple du Royaume vis-à-vis des scribes pharisiens. Au sujet de celle-ci, chacun pense bien sûr à Mt 23,1-39. Nous voudrions ajouter la relation matthéenne de l'attitude des autorités juives au lendemain de l'ensevelissement de Jésus (Mt 27,62). Tout d'abord, le rédacteur matthéen place les pharisiens aux côtés des grands-prêtres; ensuite le groupe ainsi constitué vient demander à Pilate la mise en place d'une garde au tombeau, afin que les disciples ne viennent prendre son corps et ne répandent ensuite dans le peuple le bruit que s'est réalisée la prophétie de «cet imposteur» sur sa résurrection dans les trois jours (Mt 27,63-64). Au tombeau, c'est la véracité de cette parole de Jésus sur sa résurrection que l'Ange du Seigneur confirme (Mt 28,6), alors que dans la recension marcienne de la péripécie, le καθὼς εἶπεν ὑμῖν porte sur la parole de Jésus concernant le rendez-vous en Galilée (Mc 16,7). Pourtant les autorités juives ne se soumettent pas à la sanction divine; elles soudoient les gardes pour qu'ils propagent parmi les Juifs une parole fausse qui y a encore cours aujourd'hui (Mt 28,15). Où sont les imposteurs, qui sont aujourd'hui ceux qui croient vraiment à la résurrection? Le marquage matthéen de l'idéologie

⁽⁹⁾ Cf. également ALLISON, «Gnilka on Matthew», 536-537.

⁽¹⁰⁾ D.E. ORTON, *The Understanding Scribe. Matthew and the Apocalyptic Ideal* (JSNTSS 25; Sheffield 1989) 37-38; cf. recension dans *Bib* 72 (1991) 119.

⁽¹¹⁾ L'animosité de «scribes de campagne» -les κομογραμματεῖς de Josèphe *BJ* 1,479; *AJ* 16,203- vis-à-vis de ceux de Jérusalem?

pharisenne se comprend au mieux de la part d'un homme qui aurait fait un long chemin avec les scribes pharisiens et revendique l'héritage de leur ancien idéal commun au profit de sa foi en Jésus.

Pour le rédacteur du premier évangile cependant, cette inscription de son actuelle condition de disciple dans le droit fil de son idéal de scribe ne va pas sans la conscience aiguë que ce choix demande une profonde conversion du regard et du cœur. Dans notre recension du livre de Orton, nous signalions déjà qu'il fallait peut-être voir en Mt 8,18-22, une péripécie placée juste après l'ordre donné par Jésus de passer sur l'autre rive, une description discrète de ce qu'a représenté pour l'ancien scribe auteur du premier évangile sa conversion au christianisme: quitter ses références et son prestige de scribe, donner extérieurement l'impression que l'on manque aux devoirs les plus sacrés vis-à-vis de son père et de ses pères. Nous nous contenterons d'ajouter ceci. Chez Marc, les titres de maître et de rabbi sont donnés à Jésus aussi bien par des disciples que par des opposants⁽¹²⁾. Chez Matthieu en revanche, les disciples appellent Jésus Seigneur et il n'y a que des non-disciples, parfois sympathisants, pour lui donner le titre de maître⁽¹³⁾; plus significatif encore, il n'y a que Judas pour l'appeler rabbi (Mt 26,25.49). En d'autres termes, tout se passe comme si, pour le scribe Matthieu, l'alternative concernant Jésus consistait soit à le considérer comme un rabbi déviant, voire imposteur, avec les conséquences mortifères que cela implique aussi bien pour Judas que pour le peuple juif⁽¹⁴⁾, soit à le reconnaître comme le Seigneur, le Fils de Dieu aujourd'hui exalté, avec toutes les exigences de conversion que cela implique.

En dehors de l'idée contradictoire que le scribe Matthieu et les scribes pharisiens se faisaient de Jésus, leur affrontement nous semble avoir été particulièrement vif sur deux points: l'attitude vis-à-vis de la Loi et l'ouverture aux païens. A notre sens, c'est sur cet arrière-plan conflictuel qu'il faut interpréter des passages comme Mt 5,17-20 ou rendre compte de l'apparente contradiction existant entre l'ordre de mission de Mt 10,5-6 et celui de Mt 28,19-20.

Incontestablement, il y a chez Matthieu un appel adressé aux disciples à *faire* la volonté du Père qui est aux cieux (Mt 7,21; cf. Mt 21,28-32) et Mt 5,17-20 doit certainement se lire aussi en fonction de cet appel. Nous ne pensons pas cependant que l'on puisse tirer de ce passage servant d'introduction à des antithèses où la lettre de la Loi est parfois malmenée que Matthieu exige de ses destinataires l'observance de tous les commandements de celle-ci (Luz), ni même qu'il se bat avec une égale force sur un double front, réaffirmant la validité absolue de la Loi contre des cercles chrétiens plus libéraux et contestant en même temps la position juive en la matière (Zumstein). Dans la ligne des propres conclusions de Davies-Allison sur l'exégèse du fragment (501), nous croyons plutôt que le rédacteur du premier évangi-

⁽¹²⁾ Maître: Mc 4,38; 9,17.38; 10,17.20.35; 12,14.19.32; 13,1. Rabbi: Mc 9,5; 11,2; 14,45. Rabbouni: Mc 10,51.

⁽¹³⁾ Mt 8,19; 12,38; 19,16 (le jeune homme riche); 22,16.24.36.

⁽¹⁴⁾ La catastrophe de 70 étant pour Matthieu directement liée au rejet de Jésus par les Juifs: Mt 22,7 et aussi, à notre sens, Mt 27,25.

le y défend d'abord Jésus et les disciples contre l'accusation de scribes pharisiens, qui sans aucun doute ébranlait quelque peu ceux-là, d'être les fossoyeurs de la Torah. La riposte matthéenne consiste à présenter Jésus non comme celui qui abolit la Loi, mais comme celui qui l'accomplit, en l'ouvrant sur son accomplissement eschatologique et en la resituant dans sa dimension prophétique (485-487). La mention remarquable, en fin de fragment (Mt 5,24), des scribes pharisiens, à qui le rédacteur matthéen reprochera plus tard leur lecture artificielle et formaliste de la Loi (Mt 23,13-36) est à notre sens un argument solide en faveur de cette thèse d'une orientation d'abord polémique de Mt 5,17-20⁽¹⁵⁾.

Fragiles devant l'accusation qui leur était faite de brader la Loi, les chrétiens matthéens semblent l'avoir également été devant celle de brader l'idée même de peuple de Dieu, en s'ouvrant démagogiquement aux païens. L'accusation portait d'autant plus qu'historiquement parlant, Jésus avait, selon toute vraisemblance, réservé son enseignement aux brebis perdues de la maison d'Israël (Mt 15,24). A cette accusation aussi, le rédacteur du premier évangile va apporter une réfutation capable de sécuriser les juéo-chrétiens auxquels il s'adresse, parce que conforme à l'idéologie juive la plus stricte. Le rédacteur matthéen souligne que dans la troisième tentation, localisée rédactionnellement sur une très haute montagne, Jésus refuse clairement de recevoir du diable « tous les royaumes du monde et leur gloire » (Mt 4,9-10). Durant son ministère terrestre, le Nazaréen prescrit donc explicitement aux Douze de ne pas prendre le chemin des païens et de ne pas entrer dans une ville de Samaritains (Mt 10,5-6). Pratiquement, ce n'est qu'après la Résurrection, alors que « tout pouvoir lui a été donné (par le Père) au ciel et sur la terre » que sur une montagne de Galilée l'Exalté dit à ceux qui ne sont plus que Onze: « Allez et de toutes les nations faites des disciples » (Mt 28,19). En d'autres termes, selon nous, le scribe Matthieu légitime ici l'ouverture aux païens, sans que cesse pour autant la mission auprès d'Israël (Mt 10,23)⁽¹⁶⁾ dans une perspective qui n'est pas sans rappeler Dn 7,13-14⁽¹⁷⁾; normalement, des scribes pharisiens ne devraient donc pas contester. Par le fait même, l'apparente « opposition abrupte » de Mt 10,5-6 et de Mt 28,19-20, si souvent relevée par les commentateurs, devient d'après nous parfaitement cohérente au niveau de la rédaction du premier évangile. Elle fait partie intégrante de la stratégie narrative de Matthieu, qui défend devant des scribes pharisiens ses nouveaux co-religionnaires du grief de dérive païenne.

Un dernier point avant de clore cette question de la vraisemblable personnalité de Matthieu: le portrait que nous avons pris le risque d'en brosser dans le prolongement des conclusions de Davies–Allison est-il compatible avec un premier accueil de son livre dans une communauté sans doute à lar-

⁽¹⁵⁾ J. A. OVERMAN, *Matthew's Gospel and Formative Judaism. The Social World of the Matthean Community* (Minneapolis 1990) 72-149.

⁽¹⁶⁾ Ici aussi nous nous rallions au point de vue de DAVIES–ALLISON, *Matthew* 2, 192; cf. ALLISON, « Gnika on Matthew », 536. Dans un sens opposé, LUZ, *Matthäus* 2, 116-117.

⁽¹⁷⁾ W. D. DAVIES–D. C. ALLISON, « Matt 28: 16-20: Texts behind the Text », *RHPR* 72 (1992) 90.

ge dominante judéo-chrétienne, puis avec la promotion ultérieure de celui-ci au rang de premier évangile dans les communautés de la Grande Église à nette majorité pagano-chrétienne? Il nous semble être en droit d'apporter une réponse affirmative aux deux questions. Tout d'abord, à une communauté judéo-chrétienne où les sages et les scribes n'étaient sans doute pas nombreux (cf. 1 Co 1,20) et peut-être de compétence moyenne, à une communauté qui finit aussi par se poser des questions de légitimité à la suite des accusations de plus en plus pressantes que font peser sur elle les scribes pharisiens, le scribe Matthieu apporte sa compétence et sa caution de maître en Israël. Bien loin d'être un handicap, sa conversion relativement tardive est un atout, d'autant plus qu'elle ne s'accompagne d'aucune revendication d'autorité, mais prône un clair idéal de fraternité (Mt 23,8-12). Le portrait que nous offre ensuite la critique externe de l'auteur du premier évangile, très tôt identifié à Matthieu, l'un des Douze, comme la relation qu'elle nous propose des circonstances de la rédaction de l'ouvrage sont pour nous l'indice que les raisons qui avaient favorisé son accueil par ses premiers destinataires ont également été, du moins dans une large mesure, celles de son succès auprès des communautés sub- et post-apostoliques de la Grande Église. Il est vrai que la «rejudaïsation» matthéenne du message évangélique convenait au plus haut point à des communautés d'autant plus soucieuses de leurs racines qu'elles se savaient différentes de celles qui les avaient précédées et qu'elles continuaient par ailleurs à dialoguer avec le judaïsme (*Dialogue avec Tryphon* de Justin) et avaient maintenant en plus à contenir les déviations de certains de ses membres tout disposés à couper le cordon ombilical qui reliait le Nouveau Testament à l'Ancien (Marcion).

2. Le lieu de rédaction de Matthieu. Davies-Allison finissent donc par se ranger, mais sans grand enthousiasme, à la thèse antiochienne, classique depuis la présentation qu'en a fait Streeter. Nous devons avouer une réserve encore plus grande vis-à-vis de cette opinion aujourd'hui dominante et, quitte à manquer une nouvelle fois à cette prudence dont Davies-Allison nous donnent l'exemple, nous voudrions proposer comme lieu de rédaction vraisemblable du premier évangile les cités galiléennes du bord du lac contredistinguées de Jérusalem, et plus précisément Capharnaüm⁽¹⁸⁾.

Notre réflexion part des trois considérations suivantes. Tout d'abord, à la suite par exemple de Brown, nous ne pensons pas qu'on puisse encore parler du judéo-christianisme et du pagano-christianisme comme de deux entités monolithiques distinctes; il y eu plusieurs types de judéo-christianisme comme de pagano-christianisme. La diffusion de ces différents types de «christianisme judéo-païen» ne doit pas être seulement décrite d'une façon statique en fonction d'un lieu d'origine supposé, mais d'une façon dynamique en fonction d'une filière d'expansion vraisemblable. Ceci mériterait sûrement de plus amples vérifications; mais un premier coup d'œil sur les écrits du Nouveau Testament permet aussi de repérer comme vraisemblable l'existence d'une filière pétrinienne Galilée-Antioche-Rome-Galilée avec la triple tradition, Marc et Matthieu. Antioche de Syrie nous paraît enfin avoir été

⁽¹⁸⁾ Cf. OVERMAN, *Matthew's Gospel*.

le carrefour où se sont retrouvés la plupart des courants du christianisme apostolique et sub-apostolique, plutôt que le bastion géographique de l'un d'entre eux⁽¹⁹⁾. Nous ne contestons donc pas que l'évangile de Matthieu y ait transité; mais il nous semble que les cités galiléennes du bord du lac, et en particulier Capharnaüm, constituent pour lui un lieu de rédaction plus vraisemblable.

Pourquoi cette localisation galiléenne du premier évangile? Si nous reprenons les arguments de Streeter en faveur d'une localisation antiochienne, il est bien certain qu'une localisation en Galilée permet de mieux rejoindre le témoignage de la critique externe situant en Palestine la rédaction du premier évangile; elle permet aussi, comme nous venons de le dire, d'expliquer le succès sub-apostolique de l'évangile ecclésiastique. Par ailleurs, si Matthieu est incontestablement un apôtre de second rang, il est en revanche clairement présenté dans le premier évangile comme un publicain de Capharnaüm (Mt 9,9). En outre, s'il y a une authentique tradition pétrinienne à Antioche s'enracinant en Ga 2,11, il y en a également une, au moins aussi solide, dans les villes galiléennes du bord du lac et en particulier à Capharnaüm où Pierre avait sa maison (Mt 8,5.14; cf. Mc 1,21.29) et l'archéologie semble attester de la survivance sub- et post-apostolique de cette tradition de la maison de Pierre à Capharnaüm⁽²⁰⁾. Enfin s'il y avait une importante population juive à Antioche de Syrie, surtout après 70, et même si rien ne s'oppose à la présence dans cette ville d'un centre culturel juif actif, il est bien évident que les villes du bord du lac, et Capharnaüm en particulier, peuvent faire valoir en ces domaines des arguments encore plus forts; on pourra même relever que la tradition rabbinique a gardé le souvenir d'un séjour galiléen de Johanna ben Zakkaï mentionné plus haut à propos des sémitismes de Matthieu, à Arab, près de Sepphoris⁽²¹⁾. Cela dit, il va de soi que ce qui doit être rendu plausible, dans le cadre de l'hypothèse que nous proposons, ce n'est pas l'existence à Capharnaüm d'une population juive, mais celle d'une population judéo-chrétienne dont la langue usuelle, y compris dans le culte, était le grec au moment de la rédaction de Matthieu. Il nous semble que dans l'état actuel de la recherche les esprits sont plus disposés à l'admettre qu'autrefois. Les chercheurs sont en effet de plus en plus sensibles à la forte hellénisation de la Palestine au tournant de notre ère et, même si l'araméen y était sans doute demeuré la langue la plus commune, on a tout lieu de croire à l'existence d'îlots à majorité hellénophone⁽²²⁾. On ne peut pas ne pas être impressionné en particulier par le pourcentage élevé d'inscriptions funéraires juives rédigées en grec dans la Palestine de cette époque. Au vu de ce constat, il est difficile d'échapper à la conclusion qu'en Palestine aussi et non seulement dans la dispersion, le grec était la langue de tous les jours pour une grande partie de la population⁽²³⁾.

⁽¹⁹⁾ Depuis la recension occidentale du livre des Actes (Ac 11,28), une solide tradition rattache également Luc à Antioche.

⁽²⁰⁾ E. M. MEYERS-J. E. STRANGE, *Les rabbins et les premiers chrétiens*. Archéologie et histoire (Paris 1984) 74-75. DAVIES-ALLISON, *Matthew 2*, 33-34.

⁽²¹⁾ E. SCHUERER, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175BC - AD 135) II* (Edinburgh 1979) 370 et n. 59.

⁽²²⁾ SCHUERER, *History II*, 1-80; MEYERS-STRANGE, *Rabbins*, 77-117.

⁽²³⁾ P. W. VAN DER HORST, «Das Neue Testament und die jüdische Grabin-schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit», *BZ* 36 (1992) 164.

Que Capharnaüm ait été au temps de la rédaction de Matthieu un tel îlot palestinien à majorité hellénophone, il nous semble en trouver un indice dans le premier évangile lui-même avec la présentation qu'il nous offre de cette ville. Tandis que chez Marc, Capharnaüm est le lieu de la première prédication galiléenne de Jésus (Mc 1,21; 2,1) avant qu'il n'aille vers d'autres villes (Mc 1,38), chez Matthieu, elle devient la ville de Jésus, *sa* ville (Mt 9,1) opposée à *leurs* villes (Mt 11,1), le lieu où il accomplit la plupart de ses miracles (Mt 8,5; 9,1; 11,23) et paie l'impôt du temple (Mt 17,24). Surtout pour Matthieu, Capharnaüm est la ville où Jésus, après avoir abandonné Nazara, vient se retirer et demeurer (Mt 4,13). Le rédacteur matthéen relit cette retraite de Jésus dans une perspective théologique et y voit une préfiguration de l'ouverture aux païens (Mt 4,15). Notre question est la suivante pourrait-il le faire, si rien ne le justifiait objectivement?

Cependant, localiser à Capharnaüm la rédaction du premier évangile, ce n'est pas seulement la resituer en Palestine conformément au témoignage de la critique externe, c'est aussi pour nous la placer au berceau de la triple tradition et se donner sans doute une possibilité de mieux comprendre le jeu complexe des relations Marc/Matthieu. C'est, du moins à notre sens, l'hypothèse qui permet d'expliquer de la façon la plus simple pourquoi d'un côté Matthieu a si souvent des allures d'une « nouvelle édition, revue, corrigée et augmentée » de l'évangile de Marc et pourquoi aussi d'un autre côté il donne parfois l'impression de connaître, à côté de Marc, les sources de celui-ci. Nous pensons au cas classique de l'incise marcienne de Mc 7,2-4, aux recensions matthéennes du récit de la guérison des deux aveugles qui ne connaissent pas la transformation marcienne de la péricope en un récit de vocation (Mt 20,29-34//Mt 9,27-31 à comparer à Mc 10,46-52) et bien sûr, en ce qui nous concerne, à la recension matthéenne du récit de la confession de Pierre, si tant est qu'on admette que Mt 16,18 constitue la conclusion du récit-source.

3. Le plan et le mouvement narratif d'ensemble de Matthieu. Davies-Allison ne proposent donc dans leur introduction pratiquement aucun vérifiable plan du premier évangile, la mise en valeur des triades permettant de dégager un principe certes réel⁽²⁴⁾ d'organisation des matériaux, mais non le mouvement du récit matthéen. Cela nous paraît un manque important. En effet, même si les approches de type linguistique ou narratif ont parfois manqué de mesure, il n'en demeure pas moins qu'elles nous rappellent utilement qu'un récit a ses principes de fonctionnement propres et qu'il est difficile de s'engager dans une analyse diachronique de ses différentes séquences sans commencer par s'en donner une bonne idée d'ensemble au plan de la synchronie. C'est pourquoi nous nous réjouissons qu'Allison soit revenu sur cette question, tout d'abord dans sa recension du commentaire de Gnika sur Matthieu et ensuite, tout récemment, dans sa contribution au recueil

⁽²⁴⁾ Avec toutefois quelques petites systématisations. Par exemple faut-il parler de trois fois trois béatitudes (63, 431) ou d'une structure plus complexe du type (4+4) + 1 avec inclusion entre Mt 5,3b et 10b et présence du terme δικαιοσύνη en Mt 5,6a et 10a?

d'hommage offert à Frans Neirynck⁽²⁵⁾. A nos yeux, c'est un des rares manques du commentaire qui est ainsi comblé.

Avant de proposer notre schéma d'ensemble du premier évangile, faisons quelques remarques préliminaires.

a. Globalement le premier évangile se présente comme une vie de Jésus, de sa naissance à sa résurrection. Le mouvement d'ensemble de Matthieu que l'on est en droit de proposer doit prendre comme fil directeur fondamental cette disposition «chronologique» de la vie de Jésus, en se rappelant toutefois que chacun de ses grands moments n'est pas présenté sur le même registre narratif. Les récits de l'enfance et la fin de la séquence pascalle (Mt 28,16-20) qui nous conduit jusqu'aux rives de l'énonciation sont en particulier à lire sur un autre registre que le reste du récit.

b. Cette différence de registre narratif, nous la retrouvons dans le corps du récit entre les sections narratives et les discours. Ceux-ci paraissent disposés suivant un principe d'organisation propre et leur insertion à tel ou tel endroit du récit semble se justifier au moins autant au plan de l'énonciation qu'à celui de l'énoncé. L'exemple le plus typique est le discours d'envoi en mission de Mt 10,5-42 qui n'est narrativement suivi d'aucune exécution. Il n'est peut-être pas sans signification qu'il soit inséré au moment où la crise se noue entre Jésus et les autorités juives.

c. Nous rejoignons également Allison dans son rejet d'une conception fétichiste de la formule ἀπὸ τότε ἤρξατο ὁ Ἰησοῦς pour dégager le plan de Matthieu. Nous pensons néanmoins que Mt 16,21 marque un clivage important dans la trame narrative du premier évangile. Les deux péripécies s'articulant comme les deux pans d'un toit au faîte d'une maison, celle de la confession de Pierre (Mt 16,13-20) clôt la première grande partie du ministère de Jésus dans l'évangile de Matthieu et celle de la première annonce de la Passion (Mt 16,21-23) ouvre la seconde. Les arguments en faveur de ce clivage, c'est non seulement la présence de la formule ἀπὸ τότε ἤρξατο au début de Mt 16,21, mais aussi la reprise en ce verset des mots Ἰησοῦς et τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ, alors que les anaphoriques pourraient suffire. Au plan narratif, Jésus quitte une stratégie de «retraite» pour celle d'une montée vers Jérusalem.

Pour ce qui est de Mt 4,17, nous pensons également, comme Allison, que ce verset doit être rattaché à Mt 4,12-16. En revanche, nous ne le suivons pas pour considérer Mt 1,1-4,22 comme un grand ensemble constituant le prologue de l'évangile. Sans former un évangile à part, Mt 1-2 ne se situe pas sur le même registre narratif que le chapitre suivant. Surtout, après la séquence programmatrice précisant les enjeux de l'action (Mt 4,1-11), c'est en Mt 4,12-17 que commence véritablement celle-ci.

d. Nous rejoignons également Davies–Allison pour localiser en Mt 14,1 l'endroit où Matthieu rejoint le plan de Marc. Mais nous voudrions attirer l'attention sur deux points non suffisamment pris en considération par les

⁽²⁵⁾ ALLISON, «Gnilka on Matthew», 532-536; id., «Matthew: Structure, biographical Impulse and the Imitatio Christi», *Four Gospels 1992*. Festschrift Frans Neirynck (éd. F. VAN SEGBROECK–C. M. TUCKETT–G. VAN BELLE–J. VERHEYDEN) (BETL 100; Leuven 1992) 1203-1221.

commentateurs. Tout d'abord une même série de péripécies ne signifie pas nécessairement une même segmentation du récit. Ainsi chez Matthieu la montée vers Jérusalem commence en Mt 16,21 avec la première annonce de la Passion. Chez Marc, elle inclut la péripécie de la confession de Pierre qui a déjà lieu ἐν τῇ ὁδοῦ (Mc 8,27), la péripécie de la guérison de l'aveugle de Bethsaïde (Mc 8,22-26) lui servant de porche en inclusion avec celle de Bartimée (Mc 10,46-52) en fin de parcours.

Par ailleurs, une même grande séquence peut avoir des orientations différentes dans deux récits différents. Dans le deuxième évangile, le récit du martyre du Baptiste narratisé (Mc 6,14-24) dans le cadre de la mission des Douze, rappelle que toute mission se déroule sur l'arrière-plan d'une passion et la section des pains (Mc 6,30-8,21) est celle où se noue l'intrigue autour du mystère de la personne de Jésus. Dans le premier évangile il n'en est plus ainsi; Mt 14,1-16,20 constitue la dernière partie du ministère en Galilée, au cours de laquelle Jésus met de plus en plus de distance entre lui et les autorités juives, avant d'annoncer la fondation future de son Église, contre-distinguée du système juif (Mt 15,13-14).

e. Lorsque nous disons plan, nous comprenons trop facilement découpage en unités nettement distinctes. Chez Matthieu au contraire, ce qui paraît premier, c'est la fluidité narrative du récit avec un jeu constant et conjoint de rappels et d'anticipations. Un cas typique: Mt 8,1-9,34. Prise en elle-même, la série de ces 3 × 3 miracles nous relate essentiellement ce que Jésus a fait, après que le Sermon sur la Montagne nous a rapporté ce qu'il a dit. Mais en même temps, par ses trois péripécies vocationnelles, le récit de la guérison de la belle-mère de Pierre remodelé en un récit de vocation (Mt 8,14-15), le dialogue avec les deux scribes (Mt 8,18-22) et le récit de la vocation de Matthieu (Mt 9,9), Mt 8-9 nous renvoie, en une inclusion englobant toute la première partie du ministère en Galilée, à la péripécie de l'appel des premiers disciples de Mt 4,18-22. Parallèlement, avec la reprise des trois premières controverses de Mc 2,1-22 (//Mt 9,1-7) et le récit du dernier miracle se concluant par la relation des réactions contrastées des foules et des pharisiens (Mt 9,32-34), ces deux chapitres annoncent la seconde partie du ministère en Galilée au cours de laquelle éclatera la crise entre Jésus et les autorités juives; nous y retrouverons les deux dernières controverses de Mc 2,23-3,6 (//Mt 12,1-14) et le doublet de la guérison du possédé muet (Mt 12,22-24//Mt 9,32-34), sans oublier la seconde citation d'Os 6,6 (Mt 12,7//Mt 9,13).

f. Bacon voulait voir dans le plan de Matthieu une reprise de la division de la Torah en cinq livres. Avec Standaert⁽²⁶⁾, Matthieu nous semble plutôt avoir, du moins par ses sections introductive et conclusive, la forme globale d'une *Tanak* complète, ses premiers chapitres rappelant successivement la Genèse (Mt 1,1 et 18), la descente en Égypte et l'Exode (Mt 2,15), puis le temps au désert (Mt 4,1-11), tandis que l'ultime parole du Ressuscité (Mt 28,18-20) paraît bien modelée sur la formulation de l'édit de Cyrus (2

⁽²⁶⁾ B. STANDAERT, «L'évangile de Matthieu. Composition et genre littéraire», *Four Gospels 1992*, 1245-1250.

Ch 36,23), le dernier mot des Écritures hébraïques⁽²⁷⁾. Notons cependant deux différences révélatrices entre *Tanak* et son accomplissement matthéen. Tandis que l'édit de Cyrus faisait converger vers Jérusalem, la dernière parole du Ressuscité envoie vers toutes les nations. A la différence de son modèle, le récit matthéen ne connaît pas de séjour et d'installation dans la Terre Promise: Jésus ne fait que «se retirer»⁽²⁸⁾; l'installation dans la Terre attendue, ce sera au retour du Fils de l'Homme, quand les justes se découvriront dans son Royaume (Mt 13,41), tandis que les méchants seront jetés dehors, «là où il y a des pleurs et des grincements de dents» (Mt 13,50).

A la suite de ces différentes remarques, voici maintenant le plan d'ensemble de Matthieu que nous proposons:

a. Prologue: l'évangile de l'enfance (Mt 1,1-2,23), l'instauration du contrat de lecture avec le destinataire, grâce à une première présentation de l'identité et de la destinée de Jésus, le héros, et grâce à la mise en valeur de la figure de Joseph, le modèle du juste (Mt 1,19) accueillant dans la discrétion (Mt 1,19 à rapprocher de Mt 6,1-18 et de Mt 13,44) et la docilité silencieuse (Mt 1,24; 2,14.21 à rapprocher de Mt 7,21-23; 12,36) l'Emmanuel qui fait irruption dans sa vie.

b. Précédée par celle de Jean-Baptiste (Mt 3,1-12), l'entrée en scène de Jésus (Mt 3,13-4,11) avec la relation de sa parole inaugurale (Mt 3,15), la première proclamation publique de son identité (Mt 3,17) et l'exposé des enjeux du récit: les tentations (Mt 4,1-11).

c. La première grande partie du ministère de Jésus (Mt 4,12-16,20).

Premier temps (Mt 4,12-9,34): les débuts du ministère en Galilée. Précédé par une séquence narrative de forme triadique (Mt 4,12-17.18-22.23-25), l'exposé successif de ce qu'a dit Jésus: le discours sur la montagne (Mt 5,1-7,38), l'enseignement d'autorité (Mt 7,28) de Celui qui accomplit la Loi et les Prophètes (Mt 5,17); puis de ce qu'il a fait: la série des 3 × 3 miracles de Mt 8,1-9,34.

Deuxième temps (Mt 9,35-13,58) avec reprise de Mt 4,23 en Mt 9,35: la poursuite du ministère dans *leurs* villes (Mt 11,1), une poursuite qui se prolonge dans l'actuelle mission des disciples en Israël; d'où la pertinence de l'insertion à cet endroit du discours missionnaire (Mt 10,5-42). Comme cela avait déjà été le cas avec Jean-Baptiste (Mt 11,2-19), cette poursuite du ministère de Jésus se réalise dans une ambiance de crise et de tension croissante avec les pharisiens (Mt 12,2.14.24.38). Le Nazaréen y répond en se manifestant comme le maître doux et humble de cœur (Mt 11,29), comme le Serviteur qui, sans chercher querelle, continue à annoncer le droit (Mt 12,15-21). C'est dans ce contexte qu'il faut saisir la pertinence de l'insertion du discours en paraboles (Mt 13,1-53). Quittant les hauteurs du Sermon sur la Montagne, Jésus s'assied au bord de la mer pour révéler miséricordieuse-

⁽²⁷⁾ Davies-Allison se montrent réticents devant un rapprochement entre Mt 28,18-20 et 2 Ch 36,23; cf. «Matt 28: 16-20», 90. En faveur de celui-ci, en plus des nombreux contacts repérables entre les deux passages, signalons le fait que le rédacteur matthéen semble bien s'inspirer de 2 Ch 36,15-21 pour élaborer sa relecture de la parabole du festin (Mt 22,1-14).

⁽²⁸⁾ Mt 2,14.22; 4,12; 12,15; 14,13; 15,21. Cf. DAVIES-ALLISON, *Matthew 1*, 376.

ment⁽²⁹⁾ à des foules démunies des choses cachées depuis la fondation du monde (Mt 13,35). Ce deuxième temps du ministère galiléen ne s'en clôt pas moins par un échec, illustré par la péripécie de Jésus rejeté par ceux de sa patrie (Mt 13,53-58).

D'où le troisième temps (Mt 14,1-16,20): sur l'arrière-plan de la relation de la mort de Jean-Baptiste (Mt 14,1-12), la retraite progressive de Jésus (Mt 14,13; 15,21). Cependant si cette retraite-fuite n'empêche pas Jésus d'être poursuivi par les autorités juives (Mt 15,1-20; 16,1-4), elle ne l'empêche pas non plus de nourrir les foules (Mt 14,13-21; 15,32-34), de continuer son œuvre de salut (Mt 14,34-36; 15,29-31) et d'être reconnu par les siens (Mt 14,33; 16,16). Le dernier mot reste à l'espérance, comme le signifie la promesse de Césarée de Philippe (Mt 16,17-19), point d'orgue du ministère galiléen.

d. La seconde grande partie du ministère de Jésus (Mt 16,21-28,15).

Premier temps (Mt 16,21-20,34): le voyage vers Jérusalem. Au cours de ce voyage balisé par les annonces de la Passion, les foules (Mt 17,4; 19,2; 20,29-31) et les pharisiens (Mt 19,3) sont quasiment absents et Jésus se consacre essentiellement à l'enseignement de ses disciples, leur précisant les exigences de la suite. Pour Matthieu, cette suite ne se vit pas seul, mais dans une communauté de frères; d'où l'insertion au milieu de cette montée vers Jérusalem du discours communautaire (Mt 18,1-35).

Deuxième temps (Mt 21,1-25,46): l'entrée triomphale et les controverses avec les autorités juives de Jérusalem (Mt 21,23.45; 22,15.23.34.41) avant les fameuses invectives contre les scribes pharisiens de Mt 23,1-39; nous en avons montré plus haut l'actualité au temps de la rédaction de Matthieu. Les jeux sont faits. C'est dans ce contexte narratif que le discours eschatologique trouve toute sa pertinence: par-delà une destruction de Jérusalem jadis annoncée et aujourd'hui réalisée (Mt 24,4-25), il dirige le regard des disciples vers l'avènement attendu du Fils de l'Homme (Mt 24,26-25,46) en insistant sur les exigences de vigilance (Mt 24,42-25,13) et de fructification généreuse des talents (Mt 25,14-30), liées à cette attente.

Troisième temps (Mt 26,1-28,15): l'épreuve décisive, la Pâque du Fils de Dieu (Mt 26,1-27,54) et la sanction du Père sur la vie et la mort de celui-ci (Mt 27,55-28,15), le héros reconnu dans une proximité encore jamais expérimentée (Mt 28,9-10), face à un traître démasqué dans sa flagrante imposture (Mt 28,11-15).

e. A partir et au-delà des limites du récit, l'envoi final (Mt 28,16-20). Ayant reçu du Père tout pouvoir au ciel et sur la terre, le Ressuscité peut légitimement envoyer ses apôtres à toutes les nations pour en faire des disciples; il peut les assurer d'être avec eux jusqu'à la fin des temps, réalisant en tant que Ressuscité la prophétie de l'Emmanuel (Mt 28,20 à rapprocher de Mt 1,23). Mais on ne peut pas ne pas faire non plus le rapprochement avec l'envoi en mission de Mt 10,2-5. Les premiers plénipotentiaires du Ressuscité sont les envoyés de l'Incarné. Le lien est assuré entre le temps de Jésus et

⁽²⁹⁾ Mt 13,15 καὶ ἰάσονται αὐτοὺς. «Mais je les guérirai» et non «Et moi, je les guérirais!». Quel dommage que DAVIES-ALLISON, *Matthew 1*, 51 et *Matthew 2*, 393-394, considèrent Mt 13,14-15 comme une interpolation!

celui de L'Emmanuel; avec cependant un écart qui donne à penser. Les Douze Apôtres ne sont plus maintenant que Onze disciples, parce que l'un des Douze enfermé dans sa judaïté (?) l'a trahi. Cette fissure dans le groupe des plénipotentiaires est encore actualisée par la mention de leur doute, une valeur connotée négativement dans l'évangile de Matthieu, mais pas d'une façon absolue. Ceux dont le récit vient de démasquer l'imposture dans la séquence précédente (Mt 28,11-15), ce ne sont pas les douteurs, mais ceux qui, trop convaincus de leurs bons droits, sont sans états d'âme. A l'inverse, la fissure du doute reconnu comme un manque peut se révéler ouverture vers le Sauveur, si tant est qu'elle conduit, comme ce fut le cas pour le premier des disciples, jusqu'à la prière (Mt 14,30) et permet de voir, tendue vers nous, la main secourable de Celui qui «sauvera son peuple de ses péchés» (Mt 1,22).

C'est par ces mots que nous concluons notre recension. Sur trois points, nous nous sommes permis, à nos risques et périls, d'aller un peu plus loin que Davies–Allison. Nous appuyant sur leur reconnaissance du caractère bilingue de l'auteur du premier évangile, nous avons proposé d'y voir un ancien scribe juif devenu disciple du Royaume. Constatant avec eux les limites de l'hypothèse localisant à Antioche la rédaction de Matthieu, nous avons suggéré comme autre lieu de rédaction possible les villes galiléennes du bord du lac et même d'une façon plus précise Capharnaüm. Pour remédier à ce qui nous paraissait un manque, en partie comblé d'ailleurs par des publications plus récentes, nous avons présenté un plan du premier évangile qui s'efforçait d'intégrer les apports les plus communs de l'exégèse narrative. Cependant, chacun a pu se rendre compte combien en définitive nous demeurions proche de nos auteurs. Nous voudrions simplement redire ici toute notre admiration pour la qualité et l'ampleur du travail présenté. En un mot, mais dans tous les sens du terme, le Matthieu de Davies–Allison, un grand commentaire, sage et au ton juste, qui arrive à son heure.

Grand Séminaire
5, rue d'Asfeld
F-57000 Metz

Gérard CLAUDEL

RECENSIONES

Vetus Testamentum

Niels Peter LEMCHE, *The Canaanites and Their Land. The Tradition of the Canaanites* (JSOTSS 110). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1990. 191 p. 22 × 14. £25.00-\$42.50

In einer eingehenden Studie (*Early Israel. Anthropological and Historical Studies on the Israelite Society Before the Monarchy* [VTS 37; Leiden 1985]; eine Art Synthese bietet *Ancient Israel. A New History of Israelite Society* [The Biblical Seminar 5; Sheffield 1988]) hat N.P. Lemche ein neues Erklärungsmodell für die Entstehung Israels vorgelegt, das man als "Evolutionshypothese" bezeichnen kann. Demnach hat sich das nachmalige Israel unter dem Druck der historischen und ökonomischen Umstände der SpBr aus der Bevölkerung Palästinas herausentwickelt. Neben einer Reihe anderer Bedenken (vgl. W. Thiel, "Vom revolutionären zum evolutionären Israel?", *TLZ* 113 [1988] 401-410; ders., Rez. zu N.P. Lemche, *Ancient Israel*, *TLZ* 114 [1989] 423-425; H. Seebass, "Dialog über Israels Anfänge", *Alttestamentlicher Glaube und Biblische Theologie* [FS. H.D. Preuß] [Stuttgart-Berlin-Köln 1992] 11-19) stehen diesem Modell vor allem zwei Haupteinwände entgegen: die Eigenart des Jahweglaubens Israels, die sich schwerlich mit der vorisraelitischen Religion des Landes vereinbaren läßt, und die antikanaanäische Tendenz, die den größten Teil des AT durchzieht und einen Übergang von der bronzzeitlichen (kanaanäischen) zur eisenzeitlichen (israelitischen) Bevölkerung Palästinas ohne einen Bruch, wie er die (von L. mit Recht abgelehnte) "Revolutionshypothese" (vgl. dazu *Early Israel*, 80-305) voraussetzt, nur schwer erklären läßt. Auf den ersteren Einwand ist L. bereits im Rahmen eines Vortrags, wenngleich kaum zufriedenstellend, eingegangen ("The development of the Israelite religion in the light of recent studies on the early history of Israel", *Congress Volume Leuven 1989* [VTS 43; Leiden u.a. 1991] 97-115), auf den letzteren reagiert er mit dem vorliegenden Buch: "It is my aim in this study to present a new way of explaining the anti-Canaanite sentiments of the Old Testament historians" (7).

Die Untersuchung orientiert sich an den Termini "Kanaan, Kanaanäer", nimmt aber auch andere Namen für vorisraelitische Völkerschaften Palästinas (Amoriter, Hetiter, Jebusiter, Hiwiter etc.) in den Blick. Der eine Teil des Buches prüft und diskutiert das Vorkommen von "Kanaan" in der Umwelt Israels im 2. und 1. Jt. v. Chr., der größere Teil des Bandes befaßt sich mit den atl. Belegen. Der erstere Teil verfährt exakt und detailliert, der zweite exemplarisch oder summarisch.

In einem Einleitungskapitel verweist L. auf die nach seiner Meinung von Vorurteilen beherrschte Sicht der Kanaanäer und insbesondere ihrer Religion in der atl. Wissenschaft, die sich — von einem modernen Verständnis von "Ethnizität" aus — vor allem auf die Differenzen zwischen Kanaan und Israel konzentriert habe, ohne dabei den zumindest in wichtigen Zügen "kanaanäischen" Charakter der frühisraelitischen Religion wahrzunehmen.

Die meisten außerbiblischen Belege für "Kanaan, Kanaanäer" entstammen dem 2. Jt. v. Chr. Nach einem kurzen Blick auf die Etymologie des Begriffs (unsicher) und auf das Vorkommen von "Kanaanäern" in Mari (entweder soziologische Bedeutung oder einfach Bezeichnung der fremden Herkunft) wendet sich die Untersuchung dem Komplex der Amarna-Texte zu. Die Ergebnisse sind, wie oft in diesem Buch, überwiegend negativ. Das Territorium Kanaans wird in diesen Texten niemals exakt umgrenzt. Finden sich genauere Angaben, verweisen sie auf Nordpalästina, schließen aber die phönikische Küste nicht mit ein. Vor allem aber sei die häufig geäußerte Auffassung, "Kanaan" bezeichne als administrativer Ausdruck die ägyptische Provinz Palästina und Südsyrien, als unbegründet zurückzuweisen.

So richtig es ist, die fehlende Präzision (Sind allerdings in Briefen dieser Art überhaupt exakte geographische Angaben zu erwarten?) und den wechselnden Umfang von Kanaan in den Amarna-Texten zu betonen, so wenig können die vorgelegten Ergebnisse befriedigen. Anscheinend beruhen sie auf einer stark verengten Sicht. Auffällig knapp werden die Briefe Rib-Addis von Byblos behandelt. Aber gerade hier zeigt der Kontext der "Kanaan"-Belege (EAT 109,46; 131,61; 137,76) unzweifelhaft, daß mit "Kanaan" ein größerer Bereich gemeint sein muß als nur Galiläa. Wenn Rib-Addi den Pharao mit dem Argument zum Handeln zu bewegen sucht, daß ihm die "Länder" oder "Städte Kanaans" verlorengehen werden, wenn er keine Hilfstruppen schickt, dann sind in "Kanaan" Byblos und seine Umgebung, die phönikische Küste, eingeschlossen. Davon ausgehend, wird man "Kanaan" im Brief Abi-Milkis von Tyros (EAT 148,46) nicht allein mit Hazor in Verbindung bringen können, sondern ebenso auch mit Tyros und Sidon (Z. 40). Kanaan umfaßte demnach neben Galiläa auch Phönikien und wohl auch Amurru (EAT 162,41). Das wird schließlich durch die Idrimi-Stele bekräftigt, die den Ort Ammija in das Land Kanaan einbezieht (Z. 18f.). Ammija muß, wie auch L. sieht (41), im nördlichen Libanon angesetzt werden. Es ist zutreffend, daß "Kanaan" in den Amarna-Texten nie eindeutig als *terminus technicus* für eine Provinz auftritt. Aber einige Indizien deuten doch auf einen Provinznamen; nicht nur die auf einer Emendation beruhende Bezeichnung Kanaans als *piḥatu* "Bezirk" in EAT 36,15, sondern auch der Zusammenhang in EAT 148,46 (in Verbindung mit Z. 28f.) sowie der Titel in EAT 367,8 (ein einigermaßen vergleichbarer Titel, der wahrscheinliche ältere Tatbestände widerspiegelt, ist aus der 22. Dynastie überliefert, vgl. 53f.).

Die unpräzise und mehrdeutige Ausdruckweise in Bezug auf "Kanaan" findet L. auch in den ägyptischen Quellen des 2. Jt. wieder, die zwar eine ägyptische Hegemonie über das Gebiet von ca. 1550-1150 bezeugen,

dieses aber nicht genau eingrenzen. L. erklärt die Uneindeutigkeit sozio-anthropologisch: "Kanaanäer" wurde offensichtlich für Fremde gebraucht, auch wenn diese sich selbst nicht so benannten.

Die außerbiblischen Zeugnisse für "Kanaan" im 1. Jt. v. Chr. sind spärlicher, dafür deutlicher. Letzteres gilt jedenfalls für die Belege, die nach einer langen Bezeugungslücke in der hellenistischen Epoche auftreten und sich bis in die römische Zeit fortsetzen. "Kanaan" ist hier gleichbedeutend mit "Phönikien" und bezeichnet die heutige libanesische Küste mit Tyros und Sidon, darüber hinaus wohl auch noch die angrenzenden Gebiete, die Bucht von Akko und evtl. sogar die Jesreel-Ebene.

Im Zusammenhang mit diesem Ergebnis weist L. die (naheliegende) These von R. de Vaux ab, in der Spätzeit sei die ursprüngliche Bedeutung von "Kanaan" (= Phönikien) wieder hervorgetreten. Diese Annahme würde durch die Quellen des 2. Jt. nicht gedeckt. Da aber die aus dem phönikischen Bereich stammenden Amarna-Briefe weniger für L. als für de Vaux sprechen (s.o.), hat dessen Erklärung weiterhin einiges für sich.

Wie sich für L. die außeratl. Belege zusammenordnen, ist nicht ganz leicht zu sehen, da die einschlägigen Ausführungen keineswegs immer klar sind und kein deutliches Bild ergeben. Offenbar stellt sich L. vor, daß "Kanaanäer" im 2. Jt. ein Begriff für Ausländer ist, der sich weder an ein bestimmtes Volk noch an ein begrenztes Territorium heftet, aber doch mit einem ziemlich unbestimmten Bereich an der Mittelmeerküste zusammenhängt. Erst im 1. Jt. entwickelt sich der Begriff zur Bezeichnung für Phönikien und die Phöniker. Wie dieser Vorgang zu erklären ist, bleibt angesichts der langen Bezeugungslücke von etwa einem halben Jahrtausend offen. Einfacher wäre es, mit einer Kontinuität der Bedeutung zu rechnen, deren unterschiedliche Bezeugung mit der disparaten Quellsituation zusammenhängen dürfte.

Die Untersuchung von "Kanaan" und "Kanaanäern" im AT beruht auf den Prämissen, die L. schon in *Early Israel* entfaltet hat: der Beobachtung einer tiefgreifenden Differenz im Geschichtsbild des Pentateuch und der Geschichtsbücher einerseits und der Prophetenbücher andererseits sowie der daraus und aus anderen Gesichtspunkten gewonnenen Folgerung, daß Pentateuch und Geschichtsbücher spät entstandene, für die historische Rückfrage untaugliche Quellen darstellen, die eine "ideologische Geschichtsschreibung" bieten: "...the biblical historians operated not with historical facts but with ideological stereotypes when they expressed their opinion about the land of Canaan and its original inhabitants" (101). Dieser methodische Grundansatz leitet die ganze Darstellung und erlaubt ein exemplarisches bzw. summarisches Vorgehen ohne literarkritische, redaktionsgeschichtliche oder gar überlieferungsgeschichtliche Erwägungen. J, E und P werden etwa gleichzeitig (um 500 oder 500-450), die Geschichtsbücher noch später angesetzt. Da sich hinsichtlich der Vorbewohner des Landes in diesen Komplexen im wesentlichen dieselben Vorstellungen finden, erübrigt sich eine differenzierende Analyse. Stattdessen wird eine synchrone, thematische Darstellung gewählt. Die Themen, denen L. im Pentateuch und in den Geschichtsbüchern nachgeht, sind: "Das Land Kanaan und seine Bewohner" und "Das Land der Verheißung".

Zum "Land und seinen Bewohnern" vermerkt L., daß die stereotypen Listen der vorisraelitischen Völker Palästinas sich keinem historischen Wissen verdanken, sondern der geschichtsschaffenden Phantasie. Weder Hetiter noch Amoriter hatten etwas mit Palästina zu tun, kaum auch die Jebusiter und Hiwiter. Der Hetiter Efron (Gen 23) sei ebenso ein Werk der Erfindung wie Uria, der Hetiter (2 Sam 11). Dasselbe gilt auch für die Kanaanäer. Die Verfasser der Texte fußten nicht auf historischen Überlieferungen; "instead of this they actually 'played' with strange and foreign ethnic names", um das vorisraelitische Land zu bevölkern (100).

An diesem Punkt macht sich das undifferenzierte Verfahren L.s besonders bemerkbar, das zur Folge hat, daß die Hetiter als Vorbevölkerung des Landes bei P (und hinter Gen 23 stehen zudem sicher ältere Traditionen; zu deutlich fällt das Kap. aus dem sonst in P Gebräuchlichen heraus!) mit der Einzelperson Uria in einen Topf geworfen und die Völkernamen der stereotypen Listen ebenso wie ihre gesonderten Erwähnungen in einzelnen Texten beurteilt werden. Das aber bedeutet, das Kind mit dem Bade auszuschütten! Daß Jebusiter und Hiwiter nur im AT belegt sind, spricht eher gegen als für L.s Erklärung. Daß diese Namen ähnlich wie die Hetiter (= das Hetiterreich des 2. Jt.s) und die Amoriter (= Amurru) aus anderen Zusammenhängen in das Ensemble vorisraelitischer Völkerschaften hineingetragen worden sind, müßte erst einmal bewiesen und nicht nur behauptet werden.

Zu den Amoritern hat L. anscheinend Am 2,9 übersehen, einen Vers, der den Vorstellungen im Pentateuch und in den Geschichtsbüchern nahesteht und sehr wahrscheinlich noch vor der Zeit der assyrischen Herrschaft über Palästina anzusetzen ist. (Wenn L. meint, die Assyrier seien zur traditionellen Bedeutung des Terminus "Amurru" aus der Frühzeit zurückgekehrt, dann konstatiert er damit offenbar unbewußt eine frappante Analogie zur Geschichte des Namens "Kanaan" nach der von ihm abgelehnten Theorie von R. de Vaux.) Und bei "Kanaan" selbst kann man nur schwer sehen, wie dieser Begriff zum Namen einer vorisraelitischen Völkerschaft werden konnte, wenn ihm diese strikt ethnische und territoriale Komponente nach L.s eigenen Untersuchungen der Belege des 2. Jt.s nicht eignete. Schwierigkeiten bereiten L. die "Könige Kanaans" in Ri 5,19. Den bequemen Weg der Spätdatierung betritt er an dieser Stelle nicht, erwägt stattdessen aber die redaktionelle Einfügung der Passage. Im Hinblick auf die Struktur des Verses im Vergleich mit V. 20 und 23b erscheint dieses Urteil aber als unwahrscheinlich, als eine Verlegenheitslösung.

Wie die Kanaanäer als stereotype Vorbewohner des Landes und als "klassische" Feinde Israels figurieren, so repräsentiert auch Kanaan als "Land der Verheißung" ein ideales Konzept. Dasselbe gilt für das frühe Israel, das einen Idealentwurf der frühjüdischen Gesellschaft darstellt. Das Land und seine Bewohner einerseits, Israel andererseits spielen ihre fixierten Rollen, die L. in einem von G. Hallböck entlehnten Schema von "place" und "anti-place" zu beschreiben sucht. Das wird vor allem an Gen- und Ex-Texten vorgeführt.

In dieser Konzeption wirkt Gen 38 sperrig. L. interpretiert den Text so: Tamar, ursprünglich wohl ein Typos der "fremden Frau", wird durch Überarbeitung des Textes bei seiner Aufnahme in den Gen-Zusammenhang

zum Ideal einer israelitischen Frau, die ihrer Familie die Treue hält. Die Unglücksfälle in Judas Familie sind eine Folge der Vermischung Judas mit den Kanaanäern. Insofern dient die Erzählung als Warnung vor Mischehen. Das ist deutlich eine übergestülpte Interpretation, die vom Text selbst nicht gedeckt wird. Offenbar leitet die vorausgesetzte nachexilische Datierung des Kap.s zu dieser Deutung an. Als Hintergrund für die Landerobierungserzählungen ist die ideologische Auseinandersetzung zwischen Israel und den in Palästina lebenden Nichtisraeliten in der Spätzeit anzunehmen. Wenn L. dazu bemerkt: "It goes without saying that should the analysis of modern historians prove that Israel emerged in Canaan, then it is no longer correct to consider the information about the surviving Canaanite population in Joshua and Judges as being historical" (119), dann formuliert er einen klassischen Zirkel. Fazit dieses Abschnittes ist jedenfalls: Das AT enthält keine historisch zuverlässigen Angaben über die Kanaanäer, ihre Gesellschaft, Kultur und Religion.

Kurz behandelt werden schließlich die Angaben in den prophetischen und poetischen Büchern. Sie sind im Gegensatz zur stereotypen Darstellung des Pentateuch und der Geschichtsbücher, falls sie nicht von dieser beeinflusst, also spät sind, disparat und inkohärent und falsifizieren dadurch das Geschichtsbild dieser Komplexe. Nach einer recht unentschiedenen Diskussion von Hos 12,8f. kommt L. überraschend zum dem Urteil, daß in diesem Text, dem ältesten Beleg für "Kanaan" im AT, der Schlüssel zum Problem liege. "Kanaan" entspricht hier "Ephraim" und bedeutet gleichzeitig "Händler". Diese letzte, soziologische Bedeutung könnte eine spezifisch "israelitische" Interpretation des Terminus darstellen. Die Art, wie L. in mehreren Anläufen (135-139, 146, 156f.) zu diesem Ergebnis kommt, ist schwer nachzuvollziehen. In bestimmten Prophetentexten nach Hosea lebten beide Bedeutungen, die ethnische wie die soziologische, weiter; in den Psalmen blieb nur die ethnische erhalten.

Ein Schlußabschnitt faßt die Ergebnisse zusammen und zieht Folgerungen für die Beurteilung der atl. Geschichtsschreibung. Letztere ist nicht an eigentlicher Geschichte interessiert ("Rather than writing history, the Israelite historians composed a *novel*, the theme of which was the origin of Israel and its ancient history", 158), sondern will den Zeitgenossen Lebenshilfe geben: "... the historians wanted to explain to their fellow citizens how they were to reconquer their former possessions and become a great nation again by not repeating the mistakes of the past" (159).

Die nächstliegende Ansetzung für eine so geartete Geschichtsschreibung wäre die Exilszeit, aber L. verschiebt ihre Entstehung in eine noch spätere Epoche. Das Schweigen Deuterocesajas über die Kanaanäer, die nachexilische Mischehenproblematik u.a. lassen für die Entstehung des Pentateuch und der Geschichtsbücher an das 5. und 4. Jh. v. Chr. denken. Die Kanaanäer sind darin "a kind of ideological prototype" (165) und nichts mehr.

Die Ergebnisse der Untersuchung sind, soweit sie das AT betreffen, weitgehend von den Prämissen L.s vorgeprägt. Wer letztere nicht teilt, braucht sich von ersteren auch nicht beeindrucken zu lassen. L. erklärt allerdings wiederholt, daß auch in nachexilisch konzipierten Texten geschicht-

liche Informationen stecken können. Dieser Erkenntnis sollte eigentlich eine differenzierte Untersuchung entsprechen, die aber unter Verweis auf die angeblich immer gleiche "ideologische" Funktion der Kanaanäer unterlassen wird — zweifellos eine ernste Schwäche des Werkes, zudem die unterstellte Einheitlichkeit des Bildes mehr behauptet als demonstriert wird. Unbequeme Textaussagen werden dabei auch mehrfach beiseitegeschoben oder weginterpretiert (etwa zu Ri 5,19, aber auch zu Ri 1,21 [88, Anm. 25]).

Schwer wiegt, daß es L. nach meinem Eindruck nicht wirklich gelingt, einen plausiblen Hintergrund für die "ideologische" Rolle der Kanaanäer im nachexilischen Kontext auszumachen. Sie entsprechen nicht den damaligen tatsächlichen Landbesitzern, Babyloniern, Persern, Ptolemäern, Seleukiden; sie entsprechen aber auch nicht den Samaritanern oder Idumäern. Ihre Darstellung wird mit jedem Jahrhundert wahrscheinlicher, das man von 500 v. Chr. an zurückgeht.

Zweck der Arbeit sollte es sein, die antikanaanäische Haltung des AT so zu erklären, daß sie nicht mehr der These "'Israel' entstand aus 'Kanaan'" entgegengehalten werden kann. Dieses Ziel hat die Untersuchung in ihrer massiven und undifferenzierten, von Spannungen und Widersprüchen nicht freien Verfahrensweise schwerlich erreicht. Dazu hätte sie weiter ausholen, den gesamten Bezugsrahmen der vorisraelitischen Landesbewohner ohne Fixierung auf deren Namen aufnehmen, zwischen Texten und Überlieferungen unterschiedlicher Art (also etwa zwischen stereotypen Listen und verstreuten Einzelangaben) genauer unterscheiden und eine wie auch immer geartete Kontinuität zwischen den außerbiblischen und den atl. Belegen aufweisen müssen. Eine derartige Untersuchung steht noch aus, und man wünschte sie sich mit größerer methodischer Offenheit durchgeführt.

Hans-Böckler-Str. 18
D-4630 Bochum

Winfried THIEL

Julia M. O'BRIEN, *Priest and Levite in Malachi* (SBL Dissertation Series 121). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1990. xiv-164 p. 14 × 21,5. Cloth: \$22.95 (\$14.95); paper: \$14.95 (\$9.95)

In Julius Wellhausen's view, Malachi represents priests and Levites in a state of development later than that promoted by pre-exilic D, and earlier than that of a resolutely post-exilic P. Since Wellhausen, Malachi has been integrated into many other historical reconstructions in which source criticism and other approaches have had their various places. Julia M. O'Brien, in this intelligently and sharply written dissertation, examines the passages on priests, Levi, and sons of Levi in Malachi with a coolly objective view of all methodological techniques and with a calm determination to let Malachi speak to us on his own terms. She begins with a chapter in which she surveys various disputed questions in the entire history of Old Testa-

ment priesthood, ending by focusing on the two major questions involving Malachi itself: 1) Does Malachi reflect a situation in which all Levites may be priests, as in D, or one in which a smaller group is in control of priesthood, as in P? 2) Does Malachi reflect P or not, and if it does not, is that out of ignorance of P, or out of protest against P? She insists, rightly, that these two questions have to be kept separate.

In a second chapter, she examines the passages in Malachi which have to do with priests, Levi, and sons of Levi. Since the priests are responsible for altar duties (1,6-13), or for altar duties and *tôrâ* (2,1-4.8-9), and the sons of Levi will be purified so that they will perform altar duties worthily in the future (3,3), and since the good behavior of Levi is the behavior of a good priest (2,5-7), she concludes that in Malachi "sons of Levi" are priests, not the lower ranking Levites of P. This seems quite valid, but the question of the relation of the terms "priests" and "sons of Levi" to one another in Malachi is more than "syntactic" (27, the title) or "grammatical" (25): it is above all a logical question. If Malachi thinks of all contemporary priests as Levites, that still does not allow us to say with assurance that "priests" and "sons of Levi" function "synonymously" (85, 103, 131), because, logically, the proposition: "All priests are Levites" is not convertible to a necessarily valid proposition: "All Levites are priests". Malachi's priests are Levites, as O'Brien has demonstrated, and Malachi gives no indication of the existence of Levites who were not priests, but his silence in that respect does not let us know whether non-priestly Levites existed in his time or not, as far as he as a witness is concerned.

In the third chapter, O'Brien seeks to determine the form or genre of the book of Malachi. Carrying further Julien Harvey's insight into Mal 1,6-2,9 as a covenant lawsuit (*rib*), she finds that the entire book is a unity in which the language and the structure of a *rib* are used. This issue may appear somewhat irrelevant for the purpose of the dissertation, but O'Brien's conclusions on form and unity enable her to rule out theories that the contrast between Levi faithful to a covenant (2,5-7) and the unfaithful priests being accused (2,1-4.8-9) differentiates separate groups (e.g., "bad" priests and "good" Levites), or that the "sons of Levi" in 3,3 are a wronged party being vindicated instead of unworthy priests who need to be purified.

The question of sources in Malachi is raised in chapter four. Did Malachi use D, or P, or both, or neither? Given the carefully considered arguments recently advanced for P's being a pre-exilic, or at least exilic, document, the question of sources takes on new interest. O'Brien shows that language supposed to be Deuteronomic in Malachi is not specifically Deuteronomic except in Mal 3,22-23. She finds in Malachi some, but not much, vocabulary found elsewhere only in P. She agrees with several others that what is said of the tithe in Mal 3,10 can be partially correlated with P rather than with D, and she points out that the requirement of a male animal for sacrifice in Mal 1,14 is made with a votive offering in mind, thus agreeing with a detail in P. As for the covenant with Levi, she proposes that Mal 2,4-7 integrates elements both of Deut 33,8-11 (faithful Levi, priesthood involving both sacrifice and *tôrâ*) and of Num 25,11-13 (faithful

Phinehas, covenant of perpetual priesthood and of peace). She concludes that "Malachi employs the language and ideas of both sources" (D and P), but that he "rarely uses either source without adaptation" (106). She goes further (107-112), proposing that Malachi has drawn upon or used various sources which demonstrate "the author's thorough knowledge of and facility in Israel's Pentateuchal, historical, and prophetic traditions", and that he "possessed a literary canon including the Pentateuch, Deuteronomic History and a preliminary corpus of the Prophets" (110), although not necessarily in the shapes in which we now know them. In these paragraphs she fluctuates between "sources" and "traditions". Malachi must surely have known traditions which we know only from biblical books as we have received them, but when he writes about the role of priests or about sacral practices in the society of his day, is he dependent on sources or traditions, or is he not rather dependent on his own empirical observation of the realities around him? To what extent, then, can we correlate what he writes of such roles and practices with what we find in the sources known to us?

Let us take as an example the matter of tithe and *têrûmâ* (considered separately, pp.96-100). Despite J.M.P. Smith's statement (recorded on p.100), tithe and *têrûmâ* are linked not only in D but also in P (Num 18,25-28), which prescribes a *têrûmâ* to be given to Aaron the priest as a tithe of the tithe given to the non-priestly Levites. This corresponds to the practice in Nehemiah's time (Neh 10,38-40[37-39]; 13,5.10.12-13), although the tithe of the tithe and the priests' *têrûmâ* do not seem to have been identical then. If Mal 3,8-10 reflects P, then the *têrûmâ* should be for the priests, and the tithe should be for Levites (of a fixed non-priestly status, as in P?). But what Malachi knew may also have been a system similar to that of D. Deuteronomy associates tithe and *têrûmâ* at the central sanctuary only, along with other types of offering, some of which (but certainly not all of which) were partially or wholly eaten by those offering, with attention to the needy, Levites included (Deut 12,6-7.11-12.17-19). By the law for the triennial tithe to be eaten away from the central sanctuary, however, the entire tithe is to be given to the needy, Levites included, and there is no *têrûmâ* (Deut 14,28-29; 26,12-13); one suspects that the reason for the absence of a *têrûmâ* on that occasion lies in D's abolition of all rural sanctuaries and, hence, of functioning rural priests who could receive a *têrûmâ*, which would thus be for priests in D's understanding, too. So, if Mal 3,8-10 reflects D, then the *têrûmâ* should be for the priests, while the tithe should be food (the *têrep* of v.10) for the needy, Levites included. If we factor out the involvement of non-priestly Levites, to whom Malachi does not even allude, then, all other things considered, the basic practice or system of tithe and *têrûmâ* which Malachi actually knew may have been an enduring one, codified at different times, and with different programmatic concerns, by both D and P.

The points I should like to make on the basis of that example are: 1) that neither Malachi (who says nothing of the receivers of tithe and *têrûmâ*, or of Levites not functioning as priests), nor D (who says nothing of storage, or of the *têrûmâ*'s source, and nothing directly of its receivers), nor

P (who says nothing of storage, or of the actual use of either tithe or *têrûmâ*, although Nehemiah, probably reflecting the application of P, sheds light on these details) tells us everything we need to know for comparative purposes — a point which O'Brien herself makes with respect to the tithe, in a context in which she is no longer concerned with sources (123-124); 2) that, in any case, the question of Malachi's place in the history of evolving religious institutions is not necessarily a question of sources he may or may not have used. Even when he alludes to something which he would have known not from empirical observation but from some tradition, like the covenant with Levi (Mal 2,4.8), compared on pp.104-106 with the covenant with Phinehas in P (Num 25,11-13), it is hard to see why Malachi would have drawn upon the tradition now found in P only to alter Phinehas to Levi, but it is easy to see why P, aware of a tradition of a covenant with Levi, would have altered Levi to a particular descendant of Levi, Phinehas, thereby excluding other Levites from the perpetual priesthood. This does not necessarily mean that Malachi is older than P; it means only that he himself did not know the tradition as it stands in P, or that he chose to ignore it.

In the fifth chapter, O'Brien sifts evidence for the date of the book, concluding, mainly by comparing what is said of Edom in 1,3-5 with what is known of Edom's history, and by reassessing Andrew E. Hill's linguistic evidence, that Malachi was probably written sometime before, rather than after, 500 BC. In the same chapter she compares priests, Levi, and Levites as they appear in Malachi with what one finds on them in other biblical literature and in the pseudepigrapha. In her brief final chapter she resumes her conclusions and draws some implications. Important implications are that Malachi cannot be placed readily in the developmental scheme of Wellhausen or of anyone else, and that the book does not show a socio-political struggle between priests and Levites, as Paul Hanson thinks it does.

Julia O'Brien's insights into Malachi are not limited to matters of priesthood. Noteworthy are, among other things, her suggestions for making sense of that despair of exegetes, Mal 2,10-16 (66-73). To study her work is a pleasure.

St. Meinrad Archabbey
St. Meinrad, IN 47577-1010 USA

Aelred CODY, OSB

Michael KOLARCIK, *The Ambiguity of Death in the Book of Wisdom 1-6. A Study of Literary Structure and Interpretation* (Analecta Biblica 127). Roma, Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1991. XII-208 p. 24 × 16,5

La bibliografía sobre la muerte en el libro de la Sabiduría es relativamente abundante, por lo que a primera vista parece que no está justificado el que se escriba un nuevo libro sobre la misma materia. Pronto veremos, sin embargo, que este libro que presentamos sí está justificado, ya que el trata-

miento que da el autor al tema ya conocido de la muerte en Sab es nuevo, y sus resultados valiosos. El hecho de que se trate de un estudio detallado y minucioso puede retraer la atención de los que buscan sólo resultados prácticos y novedades llamativas; pero eso mismo hace que el libro sea un fruto apetecible para los que desean conclusiones probadas y contrastadas.

M. Kolarcik descubre en la *Introducción* su propósito al emprender su tarea: «Me propongo reexaminar la presentación de la muerte en los seis primeros capítulos de Sab con la ayuda de una atenta lectura del texto, por medio de un estudio de su estructura literaria» (x). Allí mismo nos expone también Kolarcik los motivos que ha tenido para escoger el tema del trabajo, la metodología que ha seguido y el contenido abreviado de cada uno de los cinco capítulos de que consta el libro.

Se trata de informar al lector de lo que ya se ha escrito sobre la estructura del libro de la Sabiduría en general (cap. I: pp. 1-28), de la estructura de Sab 1,1-6,21 en su conjunto y por perícopas en particular (cap. II: pp. 21-62), del análisis detallado del contenido de Sab 1-6 desde un punto de vista dinámico, descubriendo así el contexto global, el de un fingido proceso judicial, en el que se inserta de modo dramático el tema de la muerte (cap. III: pp. 63-131). Los dos últimos capítulos del libro se centran de lleno en el tema de la muerte, objeto principal del estudio: una panorámica general pone de manifiesto la complejidad del concepto de muerte en Sab 1-6 (cap. IV: pp. 133-158), y un análisis bastante detallado de los niveles de significación, empleados por el autor, descubre la ambigüedad de la muerte en Sab 1-6 y explica el sentido que subyace en el texto mismo, deshaciendo así tal ambigüedad (cap. V: pp. 159-184).

Observamos que los dos primeros capítulos los dedica el autor integra y exclusivamente al estudio de la estructura literaria en bloque y por unidades más pequeñas. Kolarcik se fundamenta en los estudios que sobre la materia han publicado en los últimos tres decenios J. M. Reese, A. G. Wright, M. Gilbert, F. Perrenchio, U. Offerhaus y P. Bizzeti. El trabajo es una magnífica síntesis, muy detallada y exhaustiva, si bien las aportaciones del autor a este respecto son muy escasas; pero es que tampoco las ha pretendido ni son necesarias, ya que, a mi entender, la finalidad del estudio de la estructura literaria de Sab es más bien secundaria, es decir, sirve para preparar los análisis del cap. III: dinamismo interno del proceso de las ideas en Sab 1-6 y, sobre todo, el estudio del concepto de muerte en Sab 1-6 (cap. IV) y el de su ambigüedad pretendida (cap. V).

Hemos afirmado que Kolarcik no es original en la presentación de la estructura literaria de Sab 1-6; sin embargo, confesamos gustosamente que sí lo es en el enfoque que le ha dado al estudio del contenido de Sab 1-6, exegéticamente analizado en el cap. III y sistemáticamente en los cc. IV y V.

El autor se repite con bastante frecuencia. Quizás podría haberlo evitado alguna vez, pero es que el sistema elegido, comparable a una espiral, lo requiere casi necesariamente. Por esta razón al final es prácticamente imposible que el lector no haya captado que la ambigüedad del concepto de muerte consiste en que por *muerte* unas veces el autor de Sab entiende *la muerte física*, otras veces *la muerte definitiva* o escatológica, y las menos *la muerte física como castigo* (frecuente, sin embargo, en Sab 11-19). Kolarcik

hace ver que el autor de Sab tiene siempre presente a sus lectores, a los que ofrece una y otra vez argumentos y razones (como si de un proceso judicial se tratase) para que se aparten de la concepción materialista-nihilista de los impíos y acepten la concepción que de la vida tiene él mismo y todo judío que se ha mantenido fiel a las tradiciones de sus mayores. La concepción que de la vida tienen los impíos está marcada por la idea de *la muerte física* como final aniquilador y absoluto del hombre con las consecuencias fatales para la vida real. Para el autor de Sab, en fuerte contraste con lo anterior, *la muerte física* del hombre no es el fin absoluto sin más, sino *el paso* a la vida bienaventurada con Dios de los que llevan una vida virtuosa y la entrada a *la muerte definitiva* o escatológica, lejos de Dios, para los que viven malvadamente. Deshecha así la ambigüedad, M. Kolarcik puede afirmar llanamente que «el autor de Sab no se refiere a la mortalidad como a una condición humana, cuando hace comentarios sobre “la muerte que Dios no ha hecho” [Sab 1,13] y cuando establece que “por envidia del adversario la muerte ha entrado en el cosmos” [Sab 2,24a]. Esta muerte, por el contrario, se refiere a la mortalidad experimentada como castigo por los injustos, precisamente por su rechazo de las limitaciones humanas como trágicas. Esta experiencia de la muerte constituye una muerte definitiva» (187). No así la que experimentan los justos que es puro trámite o paso a la felicidad definitiva con Dios.

Creemos que M. Kolarcik no ha deformado el pensamiento fundamental del autor de Sab a través de una línea de pensamiento un tanto tortuosa, imitando de esta manera el proceso del autor mismo de Sab que también es tortuoso. Lo que ya no está tan claro es si M. Kolarcik se distancia o no del autor de Sab al exponer su visión de *la muerte física* del justo como *mero paso* o tránsito a la vida bienaventurada, como si el justo en cuanto tal no tuviera nada que ver también con lo trágico de la muerte en sí. Lo mismo habría que decir de la condición de mortalidad del hombre en cuanto tal que, según mi parecer, está poco valorada. Véanse si no las consideraciones del autor sobre las apariencias y la realidad en pp. 183-184.

En cuanto al ambiente helenístico de Sab y de la comunidad judía en Alejandría de Egipto el autor dice cosas muy valiosas, esparcidas por todo el libro (cf. especialmente pp. 114-123). Sin embargo, creo que no ha superado la confusión que reina en gran parte de los comentaristas a propósito de la relación de los judíos con las instituciones culturales helenísticas y, más en concreto aún, sobre la verdadera situación jurídica en que se encontraban los judíos alejandrinos, uno de los cuales fue el autor del libro de la Sabiduría. Se echa de menos que M. Kolarcik no haga referencia alguna a las organizaciones de origen étnico o religioso que tenían plena vigencia legal en Alejandría, dentro de las cuales desarrollaban sus actividades cívicas, culturales y religiosas los habitantes de la gran urbe helenística. Me refiero en concreto al *politeuma*, o corporación de extranjeros, establecido por la autoridad real central con una constitución propia y una administración independiente de sus asuntos internos; una especie de ciudad dentro de la ciudad. La existencia de los individuos y de las familias en el Egipto ptolemaico no era fácil para nadie, pero mucho menos para los que no eran griegos o no pertenecían al *politeuma* griego o macedonio, como era el caso de los

judíos. Por esto surgieron los diferentes *politéumata* donde encontraban amparo los individuos y los grupos. El *políteuma* judío en Alejandría fue de hecho muy importante y numeroso. Los judíos pertenecientes a él no eran ciudadanos de pleno derecho, como los griegos, con voz activa y pasiva en las instituciones ciudadanas (en el Gimnasio, por ejemplo) y en las asambleas populares, donde se elegían los cargos públicos a los que se les encomendaba el gobierno de la ciudad; pero por lo general gozaban de sus privilegios con tranquilidad. Tampoco se llamaban simplemente ciudadanos o alejandrinos, sino ciudadanos o alejandrinos del *políteuma* judío. (Para más amplia información del tema puede verse J. Vilchez, *Sabiduría* [Estella 1990] 477-497 con abundante bibliografía).

A pesar de todo esto mi opinión global sobre el estudio de M. Kolarcik es muy positiva. Tenemos ante nosotros una obra muy seria, elaborada concienzudamente y, al parecer, con entusiasmo. Es, además, la última palabra que se ha escrito sobre la muerte en Sab 1-6, no sólo en cuanto al tiempo, sino sobre todo en cuanto al alcance de su contenido críticamente considerado.

El autor ha querido resumirnos en la Conclusión (185-190) los resultados a que ha llegado en su minucioso estudio, detallándonos exquisitamente los pasos que ha seguido en todo el proceso de composición del libro.

Una bibliografía muy selecta y varios índices auxiliares completan esta obra que, en adelante, deberá ser consultada por todos los estudiosos de la Biblia en sus múltiples facetas.

Para terminar expreso un deseo, que supongo será también el de otros muchos: que M. Kolarcik complete la obra empezada con un estudio que alcance también el resto del libro de la Sabiduría.

Facultad de Teología
Apartado 2056
E-18080 Granada

José VÍLCHEZ

Novum Testamentum

JOHN P. MEIER, *A Marginal Jew. Rethinking the Historical Jesus*, Vol. 1: *The Roots of the Problem and the Person* (The Anchor Bible Reference Library). Doubleday, New York, 1991. 484 p. 24 × 16,5

A Marginal Jew, appositely subtitled *Rethinking the Historical Jesus*, is the first of two volumes planned by J.P. Meier. This first approach to the problem consists of eleven chapters divided into two parts. The first part, entitled "Roots of the Problem", is concerned with the fundamental questions of methodology, while the second, entitled "Roots of the Person",

deals with questions of a more personal nature concerning Jesus of Nazareth, such as his birth, his education, and his "social background". The second volume, we are informed in the Introduction, will also be divided into two parts, the first dealing with "the public ministry proper", and the second dealing with the "tragic final days of Jesus' life, ending with his crucifixion and burial" (13).

The first chapter of the book, entitled "Basic Concepts", is a useful summary which introduces the reader to the basic technical terminology employed in "historical" Jesus research. Rightly, Meier observes that many different senses are attributed to the expression "historical" Jesus, from which it follows that "the 'historical' Jesus is not the 'real' Jesus". Here "real" seeks to convey the person as a whole, his detailed expressivity which furnishes a complete picture of his personality and identity. For Meier, this "real" Jesus cannot be known through historical research. Abandoning the Bultmannian distinction between *historisch* and *geschichtlich*, which he considers ambiguous (27), the author explains the sense and the meaning of the "historical" Jesus, that is, the Jesus who emerges from an investigation based on the methodology of modern historical research (25). This "historical" Jesus is only a fragment of the "real" Jesus and historical research, as such, cannot claim to achieve better results than this.

Having completed the *explicatio terminorum*, the book goes on to present the sources. The second chapter is devoted to the canonical texts of the New Testament, from which there emerges primarily the fundamental and indispensable role which the gospels play in historical research into Jesus. The third chapter deals with Flavius Josephus and the two direct references to Jesus of Nazareth in his *Jewish Antiquities* (20.9.1 §200; 18.3.3 §63-64). In the first of these references, Jesus is used by Josephus to identify James, while, in the second, the famous *Testimonium Flavianum*, to explain Jesus' role and his death. While Meier argues for the full historicity of the former text, the strong suspicion of interpolation casts its shadow over the latter, leaving Meier to offer his own interpretation of the text, omitting any later Christian additions. The two subsequent chapters are also taken up with the question of sources. Chapter Four deals with pagan and Jewish texts. Among the former are Tacitus' account of the responsibility of Christians in the fire of Rome, *Annales*, 15.44; Suetonius' explanation for why the Jews were expelled from Rome, *Life of Claudius*, 24.4; Pliny the Younger's statement that Christians pray "Christo quasi Deo", *Letter*, 10.96; and Lucian of Samosata in his *The Passing of Peregrinus*. Among the Jewish texts, particular consideration is given to the *Babylonian Talmud*. According to Meier, however, these sources, no matter how interesting in themselves, give no further valid information about the person of Jesus that is not already known from Flavius Josephus (92). In Chapter Five, Meier presents the *agrapha* and the various apocryphal gospels. Particular attention is paid in this section to the Gospel of Thomas, whose dependence on the Synoptics Meier defends with valid and convincing arguments. The final result of this long investigation is that, if one wishes to know something about Jesus of Nazareth, then one must neces-

sarily turn to the canonical gospels which constitute "the only large documents containing significant blocks of material relevant to a quest for the historical Jesus" (139). An explanatory footnote concerning the distinction between canonical and apocryphal gospels gives Meier the opportunity to explain his conception of the literary genre "gospel" (cf. note 15, p. 143). "Gospel" is defined as "a narrative of the words and deeds of Jesus of Nazareth, necessarily culminating in his death and *resurrection*, which narrative is meant to communicate to the *believing* audience the *saving* effects of the events narrated" (my italics). We are fully in accord with this definition, even if there are others which could have been offered. But it is precisely here that the inconsistency of the author becomes evident. Meier, in fact, is well aware that in order to gain access to the historical Jesus it is necessary to go to the canonical gospels. These, he admits, are the fruit of faith (how else are we to explain his reference to the "*resurrection*", to the "*believing* audience", and to "*saving* effects"?), and any reader or researcher who wishes to comprehend them must "believe"; and yet, despite this, it is not difficult to see how throughout the book Meier allows himself to be led by a mistaken methodological preconception. Meier reads these sources, not in accordance with the definition given above, but as simple texts in which to search for historical elements. From which it follows: either these texts, even though the products of faith, are apt to furnish historical information, because faith cannot and does not wish to be untrue to its historical content, or Bultmann is right and these texts cannot be used as historical sources. But in no longer remaining faithful to the genre "gospel" as he earlier defined it, Meier runs the risk of being unable to give a correct interpretation of its historical content. What is achieved is not "history" but mere philological analysis.

At this point there remains the problem of establishing the historicity of the various gospel pericopes. In Chapter Six, Meier sets out his criteria in this regard. The criteria of historicity, as they are usually called, must be used with discretion, for their abuse will certainly not provide a better guarantee of historicity. The author proposes five "primary" and five "secondary" criteria. (It is unclear why, on p. 168, Meier speaks of "four 'secondary' criteria" when these four in effect always turn out to be five!) As far the primary criteria are concerned, we share the author's choice, now generally accepted, of the criteria of "*embarrassment*" (as found in Schillebeeckx's *critériology*), *discontinuity*, *conformity*, and *multiple attestation*, but have doubts concerning the historical significance of the criterion of "*rejection and execution*". In effect, a criterion such as this can only be assumed as the basis for a restricted selection of texts and, as such, falls outside of a range of criteria which should be assumed for all the gospel material as a whole. The criterion of "necessary explanation", which Meier rejects, remains, in our opinion, much more valid and general, offering more satisfying results than the "rejection" criterion. The five secondary criteria are constituted by "*traces of Aramaic*", "*Palestinian environment*", "*vividness of narration*", "*tendencies of the developing synoptic tradition*", and "*historical presumption*". It is surprising, however, that the author, having taken such pains to set out his criteria, makes little use of them, at least in this first volume.

The conclusion to the first part of his study, in which, surprisingly, Meier “doffs for a moment the hat of an exegete using merely historical-critical methods, and puts on the hat of a theologian” (197), deserves special attention, for one is left with the feeling of no longer recognising the direction in which the author is moving. Up to this point, Meier has wished to approach the sources as simple historical texts, and we have already observed the incongruity which emerges concerning the genre “gospel”. It is difficult to understand why, at this point in his investigation, the author remains with only the gospels as a real source for his research. The four “canonical” gospels are accepted not so much for their antiquity, when compared with some apocryphal texts, as for their historical reliability. (The affirmation that the Gospel of Thomas depends on the Synoptics is of little value, for Matthew also depends on Mark and yet is generally accepted. Why?) But from where does this conception come? Is it, yet again, that the community deliberately wished to preserve the historicity and the history of Jesus of Nazareth in order to give real substance to its faith? In short, Meier simply wishes to be a neutral historian, but he does not succeed. Not only does his methodological contradiction dog him for the whole of the book, but half-way through he feels the need to become a “theologian” in order to give greater substance to his research. But what is the “theological” value of this? To us it appears an absurd dichotomy which we would like to attribute to a misunderstanding on our part, but unfortunately this is not the case. The author maintains that “The historical Jesus, while the object or essence of faith, must be an integral part of modern theology” (198-199). A statement of this kind leaves us perplexed. We note an underlying sense of fideism or subjectivism which leads to separating the faith of the more simple who, as such, have no need of the historical Jesus, from the faith of theologians which instead requires research of this kind. The work of the theologian is not a solipsistic investigation into the ruins of the past, but serves to provide the believing community with an increasingly better understanding of the mystery of faith, for which research into the historical Jesus is essential.

The second part of the book considers different aspects of the hidden life of Jesus. Chapter Eight analyses the problems concerning Jesus’ name, the certainty of his birth under the reign of Herod, and the names of his parents: Mary and Joseph. The place of Jesus’ birth causes Meier some perplexity. Although “one must admit that on this point certitude is not to be had” (216), he maintains the unlikelihood of Bethlehem in favour of Nazareth. The virginity of Mary is neither affirmed nor denied, but remains “obscure from the historical point of view” (230). Meier’s “neutral” affirmation is that “taken by itself, historical-critical research simply does not have the sources and tools available to reach a final decision on the historicity of the virginal conception narrated by Matthew and Luke” (222). This could be thought to be the neutral position of one interested in the bare facts of exegesis, not “history”, but in fact the reality is quite different. When the author later affirms the full and solid tradition of the brothers and sisters of Jesus (cf. 318-332), he is in fact highly compromising and denying the Marian dogma.

Chapters Nine and Ten consider other aspects of possible historical certainty about Jesus. First, Meier investigates the cultural formation of Jesus and seeks to identify the language spoken by him. In this part of the book, Meier skilfully shows how the culture, habits, customs and different life-styles of Jesus' contemporaries can help towards our understanding of the personality of this man who emerges as a person fully belonging to his time, but also as one capable of impressing on it a sense and originality that are quite peculiar. According to Meier's description, it is highly probable that Jesus attended school at Nazareth, learning to read and write. His education, however, did not stop there. It is reasonable to assume that his education and cultural-religious formation continued to a level which enabled him to teach and to debate even with the doctors of the law. Although acquainted with Hebrew, the language he commonly used was Aramaic. It is difficult to say whether he knew Greek, but various factors combine to make this seem unlikely. He may have made use of Andrew and Philip as interpreters when meeting with the Jews of the diaspora (267). Regarding other aspects of his life at Nazareth, we know that he was a "*tektōn*", interpreted in the sense of "woodworker", as Meier underlines, and not as a simple carpenter. To the carpenter's skill there was added the skill of marquetry and artistic creation. In a rural society, this would have enabled him to maintain a standard of living that was certainly no poorer or less respectable than others (282).

Chapter Ten concludes this survey of the hidden life of Jesus by focusing on other problems, especially the identity of Jesus' relatives. The sobriety with which the canonical gospels deal with this question does not allow them to be clearly identified. The silence about Joseph is probably determined by the fact that he was already dead by the time Jesus began his public ministry (317). After giving a brief history of the interpretation of Jesus' brothers and sisters, Meier analyses Matt 1,25; 13,55; 12,46-50 from the point of view of literary criticism. It emerges that Joseph did not "know" Mary before the conception of Jesus "until" after his birth. Thus the author seems to adopt the ecumenical position expressed in the volume *Mary in the New Testament*, according to which, for Matthew, "Joseph did come to know Mary after Jesus' birth and that they begot children" (323). It is not clear at this point why Meier immediately adds, "Of course, we are only on the level of Matthew's redactional intention, not of historical events in the life of Jesus" (324). In the pages that follow, in fact, Meier fully embraces the thesis whereby "*adelphos*" is interpreted literally as consanguineous brother. Meier is perfectly well aware of what an affirmation of this kind means and yet he seeks to prove — to what end? — that white is black and black white in order to defend his interpretation without wishing to go into the theological and dogmatic consequences which it involves. "Needless to say, all of these arguments, even when taken together, cannot produce absolute certitude in a matter for which there is so little evidence. Nevertheless, if — *prescinding from faith and later Church teaching* — the *historian or exegete* is asked to render a judgment on the NT and patristic texts we have examined, viewed simply as *historical sources*, the most probable opinion is that the brothers and sisters of Jesus were true

siblings" (331). We have here underlined some of the terms because, yet again, they express the ambiguity and hermeneutical inconsistency of the author. He seems to think that it is possible to be a real historian or a true exegete, free to arrive at the historical event in all its clarity, only by prescindendo from any eventual expression of faith. Here we believe that he is mistaken. Once caught up in a hermeneutical circle of his type, his analysis will never be able to correspond fully to the value of the texts he examines, because these have not been respected either in their literary genre or in their nature as texts of faith. Prescinding from faith is not, in fact, equivalent to reaching certain and evident knowledge; it is rather to have taken the first step in exegesis, in this case, the step of literary criticism, therefore not even a historical analysis. In our opinion, Meier is wrong about the value of faith as a possible form of true and certain knowledge and therefore a real and valid tool for reaching truth, including historical truth. Meier seems to think that it is only by sidestepping faith — understood as non-historical knowledge — that one can reach the historical truth expressed by the texts. But here again he is mistaken. The fact that an event belongs to "faith" does not necessarily mean that the historical value and significance of such an event are undermined, even when it is interpreted by faith. Meier is a victim of that presumption which, from the Enlightenment onwards, has caused havoc in Catholic theology and exegesis, whereby believing and faith are always opposed to knowledge which has its foundation in pure research and rationality. This interpretation can be such only through that conception of rationality taken over from certain sciences which are improperly called "exact". There is nothing more false and equivocal than this presumption. Faith, on the contrary, is itself a form of knowledge which comes into being when a peculiar object of study demands it as a form of knowledge suited to its object, in this case the person of Jesus. Here is not the place to embark on what would be a highly topical discussion of the relation between faith and reason. It is sufficient to mention that the recovery of the precious synthesis accomplished by Augustine, Anselm, Aquinas and Bonaventure not only would not be out of place, but would in no way be envious of the outlook of the Enlightenment. I do not believe that here one can invoke the by now common cry of "Exegesis, not theology". Such an expression — dangerous, because it could lead to questioning the epistemological identity of the exegete — is of little use when one is to analyze a fact that is at once a historical event and an object of faith. Various objections could therefore be brought against Meier's interpretation of *adelphos* as consanguineous brother. But let us leave the more exegetical part and return to the set of criteria, more specifically to the criteria of conformity and necessary explanation. One might ask why John 19,27 says that the disciple took the mother of Jesus to his own home and not also her sons? Similarly, why is it that Matthew speaks of Mary the "mother of James" as distinct from Mary the mother of Jesus (Matt 27,56)? And how are we to explain the priority of Peter over James? And why is it that there is no mention of the brothers and sisters of Jesus outside the gospels and in extra-biblical texts? These and other questions have need of an answer which is not to be had if we remain within the perspective of Meier's thesis.

The last chapter of *A Marginal Jew* is an attempt to arrive at an exact chronology of the life of Jesus. The author is well aware that "any calculations must remain tentative" (402) and yet succeeds well in proving his thesis by placing order and synthesis between the Synoptic and Johannine traditions. It emerges that Jesus, born at the end of the reign of Herod, between 7 and 4 BC, began his preaching around the year 27-28 at the age of thirty-three, and died on 7th April of the year 30.

As we have mentioned, Meier's volume is a rich mine of information. It is to the author's credit that he has sought to give body to his theses with a textual apparatus that is enviable for its precision and topicality. The problem from our point of view, however, is of a different nature. Let the author not take offence, but in a period in which theological discussion seems all but spent, his book can be the stimulus for its revival. After all, we do not wish to speak of a chronology of Jesus' life about which, in the end, one can remain quite indifferent, but of the peculiar object of faith which, in the preaching of the Church, has for two thousand years given sense and continues to give sense to the life of men and women. A debate in this area, therefore, is more than justified.

It seems to us that Meier's work is marked by a profound ambiguity which is the fruit of a methodology whereby historical event and faith are dramatically opposed. The attentive reader will sense right from the first page that he is in the presence of something that is dramatically equivocal and will not easily understand how the author can with all tranquility make statements such as, "My method follows a simple rule: it prescind from what Christian faith or later Church teaching says about Jesus, without either affirming or denying such claims" (1), and then immediately remind us that "whatever is written is written from some point of view. There is no neutral Switzerland of the mind in the world of Jesus research ... everyone who writes on the historical Jesus, writes from some ideological vantage point" (5).

The author's affirmation that "In my own case, I must candidly confess that I work out of a Catholic context" (6) does not testify in his favour. His research is not conducted, as he proposes, in the light of the distinction which Thomas Aquinas makes between objects which can be attained by the reason and those which can be attained by faith ("Catholic readers of this book should not be upset by my holding to a strict distinction between what I know about Jesus by research and reason and what I hold by faith. Such a distinction is firmly within the Catholic tradition; for example, Thomas Aquinas distinguishes carefully between what we know by reason and what we affirm by faith" [6]). Meier, in fact, in wishing to exclude faith from his hermeneutical circle, not only fails to reach the *real* Jesus, but does not enable us to understand the *historical* Jesus either. The Jesus whom Meier reaches is rather the fruit of a preconception of historical positivism which helps neither the historian nor the exegete, not to mention the theologian. In wishing to be at all costs "scientific", Meier forgets that the first condition for "true" science is the clear identity of the "scientist".

- C. BREYTENBACH, *Versöhnung. Eine Studie zur paulinischen Soteriologie* (WMANT 60). Neukirchen-Vluyn, Neukirchener Verlag, 1989. xv-260 p. 15 × 22,5. DM 75,—

The focus of attention in this published version of what was originally a *Habilitationsschrift* presented at the University of München is Paul's use of the idea of reconciliation via the use of the Greek word καταλλάσσειν and related words.

A first section of the book gives a compact *Forschungsbericht*, pinpointing some key contributions in recent years, including Dupont, Käsemann, Marshall, Goppelt, Hofius and Stuhlmacher. From this survey, several key questions emerge: the philological/semantic problem of the meaning and usage of the motif of "reconciliation", its relationship to the idea of atonement (ἰλάσκεσθαι and related words) and the tradition-historical problem of how the tradition developed.

Perhaps the most important part of the book is the second section where the author undertakes an exhaustive analysis of the use of δι- and καταλλάσσειν (and related words) in Greek literature of the period. Making use of the semantic theories of John Lyons, distinguishing between lexical meaning (competence) and sentence meaning (performance), Breytenbach turns to a wide-ranging survey of the relevant texts. The study of non-Jewish literature yields clear results. The language of "reconciliation" is used in the context of secular inter-personal relationships, often in the context of warring factions making peace with one another. The language is not used in a religious context and is quite unrelated to cultic ideas or ideas of atonement. And in the context of political diplomacy the figure of the πρέσβυς, the messenger who is sent by one side to sue for peace, provides a striking parallel to Paul's idea in 2 Cor 5 of apostleship in relation to the reconciliation established by God.

The situation in Hellenistic Judaism is not very different. Not surprisingly in a Jewish context, God is often referred to as the cause of (human) peace and reconciliation. Yet there is no parallel here to the Pauline idea of God reconciling others to himself; rather the Jewish texts at most allow an idea of human beings reconciling God (cf. 2 Maccabees). Further, there is again no link between "reconciliation" language and "atonement" language. Breytenbach's conclusion is thus that Paul's language of reconciliation derives from secular diplomatic terminology and is applied now to the relationship between God and humanity. The parallels between Paul's language and ideas of secular reconciliation are far closer than with, say, the very few examples in 2 Maccabees where God's anger is averted through the action of a few righteous Jews.

Breytenbach then turns to a study of possibly related words such as (ἐξ)ἰλάσκεσθαι etc. He shows clearly how wide ranging this language can be, especially in Hellenistic Judaism, and that it is by no means exclusively tied to ideas of the cult. Atonement can take place quite independently of the cult. However, such words and ideas are not integrally related to ideas of reconciliation. Thus a clear distinction between the two ideas should be maintained. They reflect different origins and appear to be unrelated to each other prior to Paul.

The third section of the book is a detailed study of the Pauline texts where *καταλλάσσειν* κτλ. is used by Paul, viz. 2 Cor 5, especially vv. 18-21, Rom 5,1-11 and Rom 11,15. In 2 Cor 5, Paul is defending his apostleship against attacks from others, and in the course of his argument appeals to his role as the messenger bringing the message of reconciliation from God, on the analogy of secular envoys sent between warring factions to negotiate peace. In 2 Cor 5, Paul takes up a pre-Pauline formula in v. 19a (Breytenbach agrees partly with Käsemann that Paul is using a pre-Pauline formula here, but he restricts its compass far more than Käsemann). But whereas the earlier tradition spoke only of reconciliation by a general amnesty from God forgiving sins, Paul sees this taking place via a divine action whereby God condemns sin in the person of Jesus who dies "for us", "in our place", and enables the divine condemnation to be both completed and (for us) annulled.

Rom 5,1-11 yields a similar position. The establishment of the relationship of reconciliation, or peace, is made possible, in Paul's argument, precisely by the atoning vicarious death of Jesus on the cross. The latter is due to God's own initiative in sending the Son to suffer the divine judgement on sin in the place of humankind. In the course of the argument, Breytenbach gives two excurses, on Rom 8,3 and Rom 3,25f., arguing against theories that Paul is using specifically sacrificial terminology (whether of a sin offering in Rom 8,3, or using language of the Day of Atonement in Rom 3,25). Rather they are to be interpreted non-cultically — in part even expressing a critique of the cult.

A final section summarizes the conclusions of the detailed analyses and draws out some corollaries which flow from them. Breytenbach stresses above all the conclusion that Paul's use of reconciliation language is independent in origin from his language about atonement. The former comes from secular Greek usage, the latter from religious terminology, perhaps with heavy influence from Isa 53, but the combination of the two is due to Paul himself. It is Paul who makes the atoning death of Jesus on the cross the basis for the reconciliation with God which is now freely available to all. Further, the language of atonement is not to be seen in cultic terms. Thus Breytenbach rejects recent attempts to reconstruct a "Biblical Theology" focusing on the idea of reconciliation; so too he denies the legitimacy of seeking to develop links between Paul and Jesus via this motif. Any links between the two are due to Paul himself.

The argument throughout the book is at all times lucid and well structured, and the conclusions are clearly stated (if somewhat repetitively towards the end). The main thrust of the book is to argue for the clear differences in origins between the ideas of reconciliation and atonement, and the case is surely well made by the end. Breytenbach has clearly shown that the two must not be confused. The strength of the book must then lie in the clear evidence now available showing both Paul's similarity to secular Greek terminology as well as his highly distinctive use of it in applying it to the action of God reconciling men and women to himself.

Where this reviewer might wish to disagree slightly might be over the question of the interpretation of the "atonement" language as used by

Paul. Breytenbach produces from Paul a rigidly logical schema whereby God condemns sin in the person of Jesus. Breytenbach may be right to question how far this is using cultic language in the sense of interpreting Jesus' death as a cultic sacrifice. One wonders, though, if Paul himself had thought everything out in quite such a thorough and logical way. It could be rather that much of this language is still somewhat inchoate, with Paul using a great variety of different images and metaphors to express different aspects of the rich experience underlying all that he says. So too the substitutionary idea of Jesus' death which Breytenbach appears to defend (or rather, at times, assume) is not always fully convincing. He cites Morna Hooker on several occasions, but never really engages with her argument that Paul is thinking of a model of interchange rather than substitution. Breytenbach's argument is conducted along somewhat Germanic lines, very much with German sparring partners; consideration of scholars such as S. K. Williams on Jesus' death, or Frances Young on sacrifice, might have produced a broader perspective.

Nevertheless, these are small quibbles. There is no question that, in its analysis of the language of "reconciliation", the book makes an extremely important and valuable contribution which cannot be ignored in future studies of Paul and other NT texts. Breytenbach has put us all in his debt with the evidence he has assembled here, and his further arguments about the structure of Paul's beliefs about the atonement, clearly and incisively presented, make this book essential reading for all those concerned with this central aspect of Pauline studies.

Department of Religions and Theology
University of Manchester
Manchester M13 9PL, England

C. M. TUCKETT

Georg STRECKER, *Die Johannesbriefe* (Kritisch-Exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament 14). Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989. 381 p. 17,2 × 24,2. DM 98,—

Recent years have witnessed not only a flurry of new commentary series as well as new editions within old series, but also — at least within the English-speaking world — considerable discussion concerning the nature and function, and hence the future, of 'the commentary'. If the former phenomenon implies a continuing, perhaps expanding, market, the latter presents the reviewer with further problems. How is a commentary to be reviewed? Detailed discussion of the exegetical decisions taken by the author can too easily become merely the sketch of an alternative commentary, questions of approach and principle may reflect fundamental differences in the expectations of a commentary. In this case we are guided both by the series title, Meyers *kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar*, and by its avowed goal which is not 'scholarly discussion but the uniting of theory and practice in order to

serve the proclamation of the church' (*Vorwort*). It may be a sign of the difference in the church and scholarly contexts in England (the home of the reviewer) and Germany that in the former a commentary of the size, nature and substance of this would probably find its readership almost exclusively in the university setting; the introduction starts with 'Patristic attestation' and contains no comprehensive discussion of the theology of the Epistles. Prime place is given to questions of syntax and text, while the more extensive discussion of key terms or concepts treated in the Excurses (for example on life, joy, light and darkness) focuses firmly on their history-of-religions background and on wider Johannine usage. Yet the commentary does not proceed by a running engagement with other scholarly views or multiple possibilities of interpretation — although these are not ignored as the footnotes reveal — but by direct exposition of the text, so that the modern reader is addressed in the same way as was the earliest. There is one further preliminary consideration for the reviewer: the Johannine Epistles set their own distinctive agenda. Any commentator must decide the extent to which the Fourth Gospel is to be taken into account. At its simplest, those who hold a common author responsible for all the writings will feel free to enrich what has often been seen as the more limited range of thought of the First Epistle by that of the Gospel; more commonly in recent writing a complex history is presupposed by which 1 John is opposing deviants from within its own tradition who, like the author himself but with less justification in both his and most commentators' eyes, looked to the Fourth Gospel as their authority. Such a setting would demand a certain one-sidedness in 1 John's argument, necessitate consideration of the Gospel it was claiming to represent, and root its polemical style in a specific historical context rather than in the very structure of its theological procedure. It is perhaps ironical that 1 John, which in many ways is one of the most imprecise of the New Testament letters regarding authorship, readers and location, should have been so widely afforded one of the most precise settings, thus raising most acutely the question underlying all this opening discussion — how is a (historical)-critical commentary to serve the proclamation of the church?

In an article in *New Testament Studies* 32 (1986) 31-47, 'Die Anfänge der johanneischen Schule', G. Strecker had already developed his understanding of this crucial question of the historical relation between the Johannine writings. He is not alone in arguing for the separate authorship not just of the Gospel and 1 John but also of the two minor Epistles, while in rejecting the knowledge and use of the Gospel by the author of 1 John he joins a growing number of recent studies. His distinctive perspective is to present 2 John (soon followed by 3 John) as 'the beginning of the Johannine school', the First Epistle and Gospel as independent expressions of that school's subsequent development from an apocalyptic Christianity in on-going conflict with docetic counter tendencies.

The attraction of the thesis is its ability to explain the survival of the two minor Epistles as foundation documents of the school, and to identify their author with Papias's famous Presbyter John, without imposing on the Gospel the earlier and yet more illustrious Apostle as author. It depends on

taking far more seriously than do many commentators that the tense of the participle ἐρχόμενος in the confession of 2 John 7 most naturally refers to a future coming in the flesh and not to the past incarnation, although Strecker's argument that Barnabas 6.9 offers a parallel as looking forward to the parousia and not as a prophetic anticipation of the incarnation fails to convince. Yet a move from 2 John to 1 John is exegetically far less convincing than the reverse, something partly obscured by Strecker's adherence to the canonical order as opposed to the chronological order he proposes. Both minor Epistles use as a matter of course terms and concepts which are familiar to us — and surely to the readers — from a richer context in the First Epistle. Except for the material proper to the epistolary framework there is little in 2 John that is not 'anticipated' in 1 John; what there is — the injunction of vv. 9-11 to exclude visiting false teachers — is precisely the passage one would expect 1 John to pick up and develop if it was using the smaller letter as a model. A key case is the love command, 'old' in 2 John 4-6, 'old and yet new' in 1 John 2,7-11, 'new' in John 13,34f.; this order adopted by Strecker reverses that of the majority of commentators who see a growing concern with tradition within the Johannine school. While there may well be a degree of subjectivity in deciding which progression is most likely, it is surely difficult to say that '2 John 5 enthält die konkreteste Aussage und stellt die traditions-geschichtliche Grundlage für die ausgeführten Reflexionen in JohEv 13,34f bzw. 1 Joh 2,7f dar' (331, n. 19) without assuming that the first readers of 2 John had a tradition which established both the authority ('from the beginning') and fuller content of the command — a tradition which is very well supplied by the First Epistle!

The recognition that the Gospel and 1 John represent independent documents of the Johannine tradition allows the independent theological significance of the Epistle to be heard. This is strengthened when explicit polemic is limited to the dogmatic sections (4,2f.; 5,5) and not made a fundamental interpretative principle of the whole letter, as it has been in the major commentaries of R. Brown and, to some extent, R. Schnackenburg. Yet this independence is qualified when the self-understanding or ideas differently expressed in John and 1 John are stated to be effectively no different from each other (e.g. p. 79 on light). This attempt to see a common message extends beyond the limits of the Johannine literature. While Strecker recognises fundamental differences between Pauline and Johannine theology, he does not want to overstress these: in Johannine as well as in Pauline thought faith is not to be identified with achievement so that it is 'unusual' that in 3,23 the content of the command is faith in Christ (201); in 5,12 'life is in the son' recalls the 'in Christ' formula and may point to a Pauline background to the Johannine school (289), while the tensions just noted as to whether faith is a work (3,23, cf. John 6,29) point to the post-Pauline characteristic of Johannine thought (199). We see here perhaps something of the tension in which this commentary stands with its predecessor in the Meyers series, that by Rudolf Bultmann. Strecker rightly rejects the source and redaction analysis of the latter which fails to recognise the liveliness of debate which lies behind all the Johannine

writings and is an integral feature of their theology; yet he continues that tradition of interpretation which sees the Christian community as faced with the existential decision whether they will give God the glory (87 on 1,10), with the demand 'to become what they are' (174-175 on the tension between the not being able to sin of 3,9-10 and the call to confess sins), or with the necessity that 'faith and works' must not be cut loose from each other (199 on 3,22), using both a framework and language which are equally if not primarily applicable to the Pauline writings. There is a danger that the specificity of 1 John, explicit in 2,18f. and implied elsewhere, is lost through an attempt to uncover a common or integrative theological discourse within the New Testament writings in which Paul provides the lodestone — a potential foundation for a New Testament theology, although this is hardly the author's goal. Historical critical analysis of these writings — and here lies the problem of this method for commentary writers who seek to serve the church's proclamation — provides insights not only into their original vitality but also into the offence of their particularity. For example, it must be recognised that although 1 John is often dearly loved as 'the Epistle of love', the Johannine love command is throughout clearly directed only to fellow members of the community; it is, as Strecker rightly notes, a function or expression of Johannine ecclesiology (331-332). Yet this means that a commentary on 2 or 1 John must hesitate to say that despite this original location, the command 'eine positiv-universalistische Ausrichtung enthält' (ibid.), however much a wider understanding of Christian love demands this. There is a touch of irony that in order to fulfil the goal of the letter the commentary must tend to reverse its original intention: for the letter 'es geht nicht um eine theoretische Analyse, sondern um den Aufruf zu konkreter Tat' (263); for the commentary a purely historical description might too easily become a theoretical analysis and it is by abstracting the message that it becomes a summons to action for a new readership.

By setting the beginnings of Johannine theology in the realism of the apocalyptic expectation of the Presbyter, Strecker poses an important question to the dominant view which has seen it as formed by its relations with gnosticism, however defined, both (or either) by attraction or by opposition. One might expect as a consequence a firmer grasp of the extent of the influence of the Old Testament and its exegesis; instead this is firmly denied. It is probably true that recent attempts to discover a pervasive covenant theology in 1 John are mistaken, but a good case can be made for an extensive influence of an exegesis of the Cain narrative in ch. 3 of 1 John beyond the explicit reference to Cain in v.11 (so already Windisch, *Die katholischen Briefe*), for the influence of God as ἀληθινός in the OT polemic against idols in 5,20-21 (ctr. p.308), and for a tradition of reflection on and interpretation of the OT elsewhere, as the Gospel itself indicates. Such a recognition complements and gives added content to the picture offered by this commentary of 1 John (like John) as drawing on the 'Johannine school discussions', for surely the exegesis of Scripture was the most common starting point for such discussion within all of the New Testament communities.

That this commentary raises such fundamental questions is a sign of its importance. There are other questions being asked, as indicated earlier, in the world of New Testament interpretation both about the rationale behind any commentary and about the contribution of other approaches than the historical critical or of avowed commitment to a particular stance; such questions are also important and need addressing, but they might not come under the heading of 'kritisch-exegetischer' and it as a model of this tradition that Strecker's commentary is to be welcomed.

Department of Theology and Religious Studies
King's College London
Strand
London WC2R 2LS

Judith LIEU

Varia

Raymond WESTBROOK, *Studies in Biblical and Cuneiform Law* (Cahiers de la Revue Biblique 26). Paris, J. Gabalda, 1988. 150 p. 16 × 24,5. 160 FF

R. Westbrook's Studien zu biblischem und keilschriftlichem Recht sind einerseits Untersuchungen und Darlegungen zu Einzelfragen des Ausgleichs für Unrecht ("redress of wrongs", 8) in verschiedenen Bereichen (Kap. I: Abuse of Power; II: Revenge, Ransom and Talio; III: Maltreatment of Slaves; IV: Theft and Receiving Stolen Goods), andererseits sollen die Studien insgesamt W.s These einer gemeinsamen Rechtstradition ("common legal tradition") für keilschriftliches und biblisches Recht darstellen und belegen.

Die einzelnen Untersuchungen zeichnen sich bei aller Kürze durch ihren Materialreichtum (neben den Rechtskorpora werden auch rechtliche Dokumente und narrative Texte herangezogen) ebenso aus wie durch ihre klare Präsentation — bei Studien auf dem Gebiet der Rechtstexte eine selten anzutreffende Qualität. Aus der Fülle der Anregungen werden im folgenden nur zwei Aspekte herausgegriffen: die Grundposition W.s, seine These eines "common law", (I.) und die Hinweise W.s zum Verständnis der Diebstahlgesetzgebung im Bundesbuch Ex 21,37–22,3 (II.).

I. Die These einer gemeinsamen Rechtstradition. W. nimmt für den Bereich der keilschriftlichen Kulturen eine "common legal tradition" an, in die sich auch die biblischen Rechtstexte einreihen, und die in Ausläufern noch die früheste römische Gesetzgebung bestimmt. (Die Frage nach der Zuordnung griechischer und ägyptischer Verhältnisse zu dieser Tradition bleibt aufgrund ihrer Komplexität ausgeklammert, 1, Anm. 1). Faßbar wird die gemeinsame Tradition u.A. in den mehr als nur sachbedingten Übereinstimmungen von Konzeption (wie z.B. Elementen altorientalischer Königs-ideologie) und in den formalen und inhaltlichen Gemeinsamkeiten der die Kodizes prägenden Rechtsgelehrsamkeit, (die W. im Gefolge von F.R.

Kraus, "Ein zentrales Problem des altmesopotamischen Rechtes: Was ist der Codex Hammurabi?", *Genava* 8 [1960] 283-296 und J. Bottéro, "Le 'Code' de Hammurabi", *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa* 12 [1982] 409-444, annimmt. Vgl. dazu nun auch W., "Cuneiform Law Codes and the Origins of Legislation", *ZA* 79 [1989] 201-222). W. deutet diese Elemente im Sinne eines nicht nur auf formale Rechtsgelehrsamkeit (etwa Redaktionstechniken) oder Einzelfalltraditionen beschränkten Zusammenhangs: für ihn steht dahinter ein gemeinsames "common law", ein "traditional corpus of unwritten law, built up mostly through precedents, together with the occasional intervention of administrative measures (5; vgl. 4, Anm. 15), zu dem sich die Rechtskodizes als Zeugnisse (5), als rechtsgelehrte Systematisierungen und auch als Stellungnahmen verhalten.

Rechtskodizes stehen damit in einem zweifachen Horizont: dem der gemeinsamen Tradition der wissenschaftlichen Beschäftigung mit Recht, in der es einen Kanon von Fallbeispielen und Regeln der Abhandlung gibt und darüber hinaus in einem Horizont des allgemeinen "common law", zu dem sie Stellung nehmen oder das sie einfach — systematisierend — wiedergeben. Zum vollen Verständnis ist immer der ganze Horizont mitzuhören, soweit er (uns) aus der Gesamtheit der vorhandenen (keilschriftlichen und biblischen) Texte zu einer Frage zugänglich ist. Das bedeutet, daß zum einen bei den "Schulproblemen" (= aus Rechtsentscheidungen in Grenzfällen gebildete Rechtssätze mit anschließenden Variationen des Tatbestands, 4) das Fehlen von Aspekten in einem Kodex nicht notwendig ihre entsprechende Abwesenheit im Rechtssystem bedeutet — die üblichere Argumentation — sondern daß die Gesamtheit des Schulproblems (wie es uns heute aus allen zugänglichen Texten rekonstruierbar wäre) implizit vorausgesetzt wird und darin bewußt Schwerpunkte einer Auswahl getroffen werden, soweit dem nichts explizit widerspricht. Zum andern — und hier liegt ab Kap. II ein Schwerpunkt der Studien — gilt, daß alternative Vorgehensweisen, die an einer Stelle plausibel gemacht werden können bzw. die zum Bestand des "common law" gehörig erscheinen, auch an Stellen gelten, an denen sie in den Kodizes nicht ausdrücklich mitgenannt werden. Hier entwickelt W. die These, daß Ersatzleistung als Geldzahlung (ransom) und Vergeltung als Todessanktion oder Talio (revenge; talio) eine grundsätzlich immer vorausgesetzte Verfahrensalternative darstellen.

Entscheidend für W.s Ansatz ist demnach die Deutung dessen, was nicht in den Texten steht: für W. ist das Schweigen positiv gefüllt, mit Voraussetzungen des common law und der Wissenschaftstradition, wie sie uns (fragmentarisch) über sämtliche vorhandenen Texte zugänglich und rekonstruierbar sind. Nur vor dem explizit gemachten Schweigen lassen sich die Texte deuten und gewinnen ihre je eigene Kontur. W. spricht von einer positiven Argumentation aus dem Schweigen der Texte und einem "holistischen" Verstehensansatz.

W. vertritt in der Diskussion um das Verhältnis von biblischem Recht und Keilschriftrechten damit eine dezidierte Position. E. Otto meint, solch "rechtshistorische(r) 'patternism'" werde den Differenzierungen im altorientalischen wie biblischen Bereich nicht gerecht. (Siehe E. Otto, "Die Bedeutung der altorientalischen Rechtsgeschichte für das Verständnis des

Alten Testaments", *ZTK* 88 [1991] 139-168, hier 141). Tatsächlich muß W. sich fragen lassen, ob er nicht im Einzelfall wichtige Differenzen verwischt (vgl. etwa die zutreffende Kritik E. Ottos zu Kap. I, *TRev* 86 [1990] 285), und ob und wie rechtshistorische Entwicklungen in seinem Ansatz überhaupt noch in den Blick kommen können. Gleichwohl verdient ein wichtiges Anliegen W.s volle Unterstützung, nämlich der Versuch, der allzu schnellen Annahme von Brüchen und Unstimmigkeiten in den Rechtstexten zu wehren.

Ein besonders interessanter Diskussionsbeitrag gelingt W. dabei im Blick auf den Abschnitt des Bundesbuches Ex 21,37–22,3.

II. Ex 21,37–22,3. Nach gängiger Auffassung finden sich in Ex 21,37–22,3 Brüche im Text, die sich literarkritisch und oft auch rechtshistorisch auswerten lassen. (Zur Forschungsgeschichte s. L. Schwienhorst-Schönberger, *Das Bundesbuch* [Ex 20,22–23,33]. Studien zu seiner Entstehung und Theologie [BZAW 188; Berlin 1990] 162-168.)

Hauptprobleme sind dabei die Regelung der Blutschuldfrage in 22,1-2a, die den Zusammenhang der Bestimmungen zum Viehdiebstahl zu stören scheint, sowie das unterschiedliche Strafmaß in 21,37 (vier und fünffacher Ersatz bei geschlachtetem oder verkauftem Tier) und 22,3 (doppelt bei noch lebendem Tier).

In seinen im gleichen Jahr wie W.s Studien erschienen Untersuchungen zum Bundesbuch gelangt E. Otto (*Wandel der Rechtsbegründungen in der Gesellschaftsgeschichte des antiken Israel. Eine Rechtsgeschichte des "Bundesbuches"* Ex XX22–XXIII13 [Studia Biblica 3; Leiden 1988] 20f.) aufgrund dieser Sachverhalte zur Annahme eines Kerntextes 21,37 + 22,1ba (= שלם ישלם) mit drei weiteren Wachstumsphasen: + 22,2bβγ (Bestimmung bei Zahlungsunfähigkeit)/ + 22,1.2a (Blutrechtsbestimmung)/ + 22,3.

W. plädiert demgegenüber dafür, daß hier auf dem Hintergrund des "common law" ein in sich kohärentes und logisch angeordnetes Textstück vorliegt.

1. Der Unterschied im Strafmaß (fünffach/vierfach gegenüber zweifach) zwischen 21,37 und 22,3 liegt nicht im direkt ausgesprochenen Unterschied des Tatbestandes begründet (geschlachtet/verkauft gegenüber lebendig angetroffen) sondern in einem impliziten Subjektwechsel. 21,37 spricht vom Dieb, 22,3 jedoch von jemanden, in dessen Besitz Diebesgut (lebende Tiere) angetroffen wurde.

Plausibel wird dies für W. auf dem Hintergrund der Konzepte, die zum "Schulproblem" bezüglich Diebstahls gehören. Die Schuld Diskussion sieht Diebstahl als dreipolige Angelegenheit: neben dem (ursprünglichen) Besitzer und dem Dieb gehören auch Fragen bezüglich des unschuldigen (dh. unwissentlichen) oder schuldigen Erwerbers von Diebesgut dazu (vgl. die Analysen zu CH 8-12, AL Tafel A 3-6, HL 57-71, S. 113-119), wobei der unschuldige Erwerber niedrigeren Ersatz als ein Dieb leisten muß. (S. 113 ist in der Übersetzung von CH 9, 5. Zeile, fälschlich vom "seller" die Rede, während CH vom *bēl ḥulqim*, also dem ursprünglichen Eigentümer spricht.)

Der an sich in Gesetzestexten mögliche abrupte Subjektwechsel wird für W. so vor einem positiven Erwartungshorizont (zur Rechtsdiskussion

um Diebstahl gehören Aussagen über den Erwerber des Diebesguts) plausibel und löst die Textspannung des unterschiedlichen Strafmaßes.

2. Die so oft bestrittene Kohärenz der Anordnung sieht W. nicht durch die Tatbestände gewährleistet (nach ihm: 21,37 Diebstahl – 22,1f. versuchter Diebstahl, in flagranti bei Nacht / Tag ertappter Dieb [vgl. CL 9; HL 93; CE 12-13; CH 21 gehört nach W. aufgrund des literarischen Kontextes eher zu “crime of violence” 122; 125, Anm. 53.] – 22,3 unschuldiger Besitz von Diebesgut) sondern durch das geringer werdende Strafmaß der Rechtsfolgebestimmungen (“descending order of severity”, 128). Den Dieb trifft festgesetzter Ersatz anstelle von Tod (“fixed ransom in the form of multiple damages in lieu of death”, 128). Der in flagranti — vor dem eigentlichen Diebstahl — ertappte Einbrecher muß mit dem Eigentümer einen (unbegrenzten) Ersatz für (seine eigene) Schuldklaverei (bei dem Eigentümer) aushandeln (“unlimited ransom in lieu of slavery”, 128). Der unschuldige Besitzer gestohlenen Gutes gibt festgelegten Ersatz für Sklaverei (“fixed ransom in the form of multiple damages in lieu of slavery”, 128).

Anders als Otto und Schwienhorst-Schönberger hält W. das שלם שלם von Ex 22,2ba also für nicht notwendig nur auf gestohlenen Gut beziehbar. (Otto, *Wandel der Rechtsbegründungen*, 20f., bindet 21,2ba an 21,37; Schwienhorst-Schönberger, *Das Bundesbuch*, 177f., sieht in 22,2a nicht einen in flagranti ertappten, sondern einen bei Tag überführten Dieb, dessen Lebensrecht — gerade im Gegenzug zu Bestimmungen wie CH 8 — gesichert werden soll.)

Nach W.s Thesen zum Verständnishintergrund von Ex 21,37–22,3 bietet der Text in überzeugender Weise ein geschlossenes Bild. Gerade dieses Beispiel zeigt, wie fruchtbar die Anstöße durch W.s Grundansatz sein können. Der weiteren Entwicklung und Differenzierung seiner These eines common law kann man mit Spannung entgegensehen (s. einstweilen W., “Adultery in Ancient Near Eastern Law”, *RB* 97 [1990] 542-580, bes. 547f., sowie das Vorwort zu W., *Property and the Family in Biblical Law* [JSOTSS 113; Sheffield 1991]).

Am Dammgraben, 94
D-6000 Frankfurt M. 90

Ruth SCORALICK

Pierre PRIGENT, *Le Judaïsme et l'image* (Texte und Studien zum Antiken Judentum 24). Tübingen, J.C.B. Mohr, 1990. XVIII-381 p., 60 fig., 4 pl. 23,5 × 16. DM 178,—

Das Verhältnis des antiken und mittelalterlichen Judentums zu bildlichen Darstellungen ist seit E. R. Goodenoughs Standardwerk (*Jewish Symbols in the Greco Roman Period*, 13 Bände [Bollingen Series 37; New York 1953-1968]) und in Auseinandersetzung damit in mehreren gewichtigen Publikationen neu bedacht worden (bes. J. Gutman, *No Graven Images. Studies in Art and the Hebrew Bible* [The Library of Biblical Studies; New York

1971]; *The Synagogue: Studies in Origins, Archaeology and Architecture*. Selected with a Prolegomenon by J. Gutman [New York 1975]; *Dura-Europos: The Dura Europos Synagogue; A Re-evaluation* (1932-1972) [Religion and Arts 1; Missoula 1973]). Das vorliegende Buch von Pierre Prigent stellt im Rahmen dieses *renouveau's* einen spezifisch *theologischen* Beitrag zum Verständnis der zur Verfügung stehenden jüdischen Bildwerke und Bildträger dar.

Damit ist eine erste Abgrenzung gegeben: Wer eine vollständige Sammlung jüdischer Bildkunst sucht, ist (natürlich) weiterhin auf Goodenough als Basiswerk verwiesen und findet eine systematische Aufarbeitung und Präsentation vorbildlich bei R. Hachlili (*Ancient Jewish Art and Archaeology in the Land of Israel* [Handbuch der Orientalistik Abt. VII, Bd. 1, Abschn. 2/B, Lfg. 4; Leiden-New York-Kopenhagen-Köln 1988]). Die zu interpretierenden Materialien sind somit bekannt. Auch geht es Prigent nicht darum neueste Funde und Fündchen zu benutzen, um eine spektakuläre These an ein hungriges Publikum zu bringen. In diesem Sinn ist das Buch mit Recht nicht *à jour*. Die Präsentation der Materialien ist m.E. auch sonst nicht die Stärke dieses Buches: Die 60 Abbildungen dokumentieren bei weitem nicht alle besprochenen Objekte und sind nicht gerade von Künstlerhand gestaltet (vgl. bes. die Mosaiken auf S. 129, 133, 157!). Die Beschreibungen von Bildmotiven oder -kompositionen sind unterschiedlich ausführlich gestaltet, manchmal in mehreren Abschnitten oder Anläufen geboten, manchmal auch in bewusster Reduktion kurz gehalten. Das theologische Anliegen steuert da die (Be-)Schreibweise und eine manchmal fast mündliche Vortragsweise drängt vorwärts zur theologischen Bewältigung der Materialien. Für Leser und Leserinnen besonders deutschsprachiger Zunge wird dadurch die Lektüre zu einer etwas ungewohnten Wanderung durch die jüdische Ikonographie, bei welcher lebendige Beschreibung und systematische Materialbewältigung abwechselnd zum Zuge kommen.

Die besprochenen Objekte sind Synagogen, Münzen und Gemmen (nur sporadisch und ohne die hasmonäischen Münzen), Mosaiken und Maleereien. Kap. 3 ist den Synagogen mit ihrer Architektur (Tore, Fassaden, Innenausstattung) und der synagogalen Symbolik (*aron, lulav, ethrog, schofar, menora, 'Inzenschaufel', zwei Löwen*), jedoch ohne die z.T. bis in pagane Motive gehende Ornamentik (vgl. die Meduse in Chorazin, die Fabelwesen in Kafarnaum usw.) gewidmet. Kap. 4 behandelt "biblische Szenen und Themen" auf ganz unterschiedlichen Bildträgern, wobei sowohl zweifelhaften (David und Goliath, Adam und Eva, Abraham und Sara, Salomon) und weniger wichtigen (Noah, Samson) wie auch den dominanten *sujets* (Daniel, Isaakopfer, *paradiesische Szenen*) nachgegangen wird. Kap. 5 verfolgt heidnische Motive wie 'Leda und der Schwan', Viktorien, Masken, Adler, Löwe, Stier u.a. auf Grabmonumenten (bes. Bet-Shearim), auf dem Mosaik von Leontis (Nil, Odysseus; zusätzlich Orpheus) und in den Zodiaken der Synagogen des Heiligen Landes (Na'aran, Bet-Alpha, Hammat Tiberias, Isfija, Chirbet Sussija, Jafia und En-Gedi). Die fast 100 Seiten von Kap. 6 sind dann der Synagoge von Dura-Europos und deren Bilderzyklen gewidmet, Kap. 7 untersucht die "Botschaft (*témoignage*) der Manuskripte" aus christlicher Hand (Pentateuch von Tours; Genesis von Wien; Cot-

ton-Genesis, Oktateuche) und die jüdischen illustrierten Pesach-Haggadot des 13. und 14. Jh., wobei die Frage nach Abhängigkeiten und gegenseitiger Beeinflussung jüdischer und christlicher Darstellungskunst leitend ist (deshalb auch Kap. 7.4 und 7.5: Santa Maria Maggiore und Santa Sabina, Rom). Dies führt zu einem abschliessenden Kapitel 8 über die "christliche (oder vor allem christliche) Katakombe" der Via Latina.

Die leitende theologische Frage des Buches ist es nun: Wie sind die klar jüdischen Bilddokumente zu verstehen im Rahmen jenes Glaubens, der stets unter dem Imperativ des biblischen "Bilderverbotes" steht, dieses aber im Lauf der Jahrhunderte unterschiedlich interpretiert. Die beiden ersten Kapitel gehen dieser Frage historisch nach. Kap. 1 gibt einen sehr pauschalen Überblick von biblischer Zeit (Ex 20,4-5 bis zu den Hasmonäern!) über die herodianische Epoche bis zu den Münzen des ersten und zweiten jüdischen Krieges. Zwar hat die Monographie von Silvia Schroer (*In Israel gab es Bilder* [OBO 74; Freiburg/CH-Göttingen]) aus dem Jahr 1987 gerade noch in einer Fussnote 1^{bis} Einlass gefunden, aber verarbeitet ist sie nicht. Dies gilt auch für die doch beachtliche Anzahl von Werken zum Thema aus der Hand von Othmar Keel, der in der Bibliographie ganz fehlt. Dies hängt sicher mit dem Schwerpunkt 'Judentum' zusammen, für den Prigent im Vorwort überraschend den 2. jüd. Krieg als *terminus post quem* wählt. Dadurch fallen die hasmonäischen Münzen, die Gräber aus der Zeit des 2. Tempels (z.B. das Jasongrab mit seinen Zeichnungen), die ganze herodianische Zeit (Tempel, Huldatore, jüdisches Viertel) und die bildliche Münzpropaganda der beiden Aufstände in die nur zusammengefasst gebotene Vorzeit des Judentums, das heisst, die theologische so konstitutive Phase des *Früh-Judentums* mit seiner eigenen Bilderwelt (Pflanzen, Tiere, Ornamente, Gefässe) liegt ausserhalb des zeitlichen Rasters des Buches, obwohl sich da viele Verbindungen zur späteren synagogalen Kunst ergeben können.

Kap. 2 bespricht jedoch dieses Problemfeld von der literarischen Warte her, indem es die Haltung der Rabbinen gegenüber der Herstellung, dem Gebrauch und der Deutung von figürlichen Darstellungen auf Mosaiken, Malereien oder in der plastischen Kunst darlegt. Es wird herausgearbeitet, dass *prinzipiell* jegliches Bildwerk verboten ist, das zur Idolatrie anleitet, dass aber sonst aus politischen, praktischen und ästhetischen Gründen figürliche Darstellungen bis hin zur Aufstellung von Statuen (eines Herrschers oder einer Venus) möglich und erlaubt waren und keinen Anstoss, weil keinen Anlass zu Götzendienst gaben. Es lag dann bei der Empfindlichkeit der einzelnen Rabbinen, wie weit sie in der vom Bild sehr stark geprägten hellenistisch-römischen Umwelt zu gehen vermochten. Sicher ist eine weitgehende Anpassung an griechische Sprache und die Bildmedien geschehen, ohne dass das biblische Bilderverbot von einer ganzen Richtung des Judentums (Prigent nennt sie etwas stark "laxiste") dagegen mobilisiert worden wäre. Eine ganze Reihe jüdischer Künstler und jüdischer Auftraggeber bezeugt diese Eigenproduktionen des Judentums. Im 6. und 7. Jahrhundert ist dann jedoch eine ikonoklastische Bewegung festzustellen, die nicht nur Palästina und nicht nur das Judentum betraf, sondern vielfältige und überkonfessionale Gründe hatte.

Prigent's Position ist es nun, dass die vom 2.-6. Jhd. entstandene jüdische Bilderwelt keineswegs ein Ausdruck eines heteronomen Judentums darstellt, sondern ein vitaler Ausdruck jüdischer Theologie durchaus im Rahmen der Orthodoxie ist, einer Theologie, welche auch *nach* dem Trauma der Zerstörung von 70 und 135 vital zu bleiben vermochte und *ohne* idolatrische Versuchung mit Bildern in Verkündigung und Glaubensunterweisung umzugehen lernte. Damit wird eine klare Gegenposition zur Grundthese Goodenoughs eingenommen, für den ja die philonische Interpretation des Judentums das Hauptinterpretament für die jüdische Bilderwelt war. Damit verstärkt Prigent die auch von jüdischen Gelehrten wie Gutman (s.o.) vorgebrachte integralere Deutung von Wort und Bild im antiken Judentum, was m.E. sehr zutrifft.

Diese Sicht wird dann anhand der vielfachen Materialien der Kap. 3 bis 6 in Einzelanalysen vorgetragen. Diese Analysen können hier nicht besprochen werden. Sie legen auf die eine oder andere (immer auch diskutierbare) Weise dar, welches die religiöse Botschaft ("message") dieser Bilder darstellt, wie sich dies an den Eigenheiten der Darstellung und an der Integration in den Kult oder in eine fest verankerte theologische Vorstellung des Judentums aufweisen lässt, wobei sogar ein Raum für die Dissoziation des Ästhetischen vom Religiösen erschlossen wird. Da nach Prigent aber die antike jüdische Religion nach der Tempelzerstörung grundsätzlich in einer eschatologischen Erwartungshaltung ist, sind auch alle Symbole und Bilder grundsätzlich auf diese Überhöhung in der absoluten Zukunft des neuen Tempels und eines neuen Israel angelegt. So wie die Synagogen dahin ausgerichtet sind, so sind es alle vorläufigen Gebäude, Strukturen und Bilder.

Diese Gesamtsicht, die man in den "longues analyses" und den "fastidieuses discussions" (312) von Kap. 7 und dem "résultat négatif" (344) von Kap. 8 etwas aus dem Gesicht verliert, wird in den abschliessenden Konklusionen ganz deutlich formuliert, und wer aus sprachlichen oder stilistischen Gründen den analytischen Ausführungen nicht immer folgen konnte, erfasst hier mindestens die globale Vision, die Prigents immense Einzelarbeit prägt. Diese theologische Gesamtperspektive, innerhalb welcher die vielen Bilder Kohärenz bekommen, ohne dass ein häretisches Judentum als Bilderproduzent postuliert werden muss, macht sicher die eigentliche Stärke des Buches aus.

Universität Fribourg
CH-1700 Fribourg

Max KÜCHLER

Michael Edward STONE, *Fourth Ezra. A Commentary on the Book of Fourth Ezra* (Hermeneia — A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible). Minneapolis, Fortress Press, 1990. XXII-496 p. 24 × 21,5

Le professeur M. Stone était parfaitement préparé pour nous donner un commentaire détaillé de *IV Esdras*, l'Apocalypse juive d'Esdras, sœur de

l'Apocalypse syriaque de Baruch (*II Baruch*). Ses travaux sur la version arménienne et sa connaissance des pseudépigraphes de l'Ancien Testament en général nous garantissent un travail de valeur. Il le propose à la suite d'une collection de commentaires bibliques où la place n'est pas mesurée et dont la présentation typographique a été très étudiée. Les circonstances sont de bonne augure, et la suite ne dément pas ces promesses.

L'introduction, systématique et détaillée, progresse méthodiquement. La tradition manuscrite, qui ne nous a rien conservé du grec, source certaine de toutes les versions, se limite donc à ces dernières. Mais ici la richesse est exceptionnelle. Il y a, d'une part (je suis la classification de Stone), le syriaque et le latin, étroitement apparentés, auxquels on ajoutera la version «syro-arabe», cette version arabe récemment découverte par Stone lui-même dans sa totalité (on en connaissait un fragment). Comme pour *II Baruch*, elle dépend du syriaque, mais, à la différence de *II Baruch*, elle n'a pas encore été étudiée attentivement. Une autre version arabe, celle d'Ewald, traduite directement sur le grec, se rattache à ce premier groupe. Un second groupe est attesté par la version éthiopienne, complète, et par la version géorgienne, incomplète, qui, indépendante de l'éthiopienne, confirme l'existence d'un modèle grec commun. S'y rattache un fragment sahidique. A côté de ces deux groupes, la version arabe de Gilde-meister et la version arménienne, dont Stone a publié une édition critique et est le meilleur connaisseur, sont, indépendamment l'une de l'autre et en dépendance du grec, des textes retravaillés. Dans le cas de l'arménien, on peut affirmer que la refonte n'est pas le fait du traducteur, mais du modèle grec.

Le «bon texte» à proposer au lecteur est à chercher dans l'accord des deux groupes majeurs, et Stone résiste à la tentation de pencher constamment du côté du latin et de l'accord latin-syriaque. Cependant, comme il part de la traduction de la *RSV*, il doit avoir beaucoup de détermination pour se détacher de l'ancêtre latin et regarder du côté de l'accord éthiopien-géorgien. Il n'en manque pas.

Sur la date, le lieu et la langue d'origine, l'introduction ne propose rien de neuf: la fin du règne de Domitien, Israël ou peut-être Rome, l'hébreu. Sur deux points fondamentaux, la nature de l'unité littéraire et la signification du livre en relation avec sa structure, elle apporte des approfondissements nouveaux.

D'une part, il est clair que *IV Esdras* est l'œuvre d'un auteur qui mérite vraiment ce nom, et d'un seul. Le livre est construit, savant; même s'il utilise des matériaux antérieurs, il reste maître des parties et de leur agencement. Dès lors, le plan de l'œuvre et sa signification se conditionnent étroitement. Partant des travaux antérieurs (mais surtout ceux de E. Brandeburger et de W. Harnisch), Stone propose lui-même une lecture de l'apocalypse selon son plan (synthèse, p. 51). Un point original, parmi d'autres, est la thèse de la «conversion d'Esdras»: la vision de la femme transfigurée dans la quatrième partie, au cœur du livre, comporte l'assimilation de la doctrine reçue lors des trois premières visions; Esdras devient progressivement prophète avec l'autorité que cela comporte (31-32). La destruction de Sion, perçue comme un scandale, est le thème central du livre. Elle est l'occasion de

questions touchant à la théodicée qui révèlent, au dire de Stone (36), plus de perspicacité philosophique que la réponse, la vision de la Jérusalem restaurée.

Reste à situer *IV Esdras* dans la littérature juive. Il s'agit bien d'une apocalypse; l'auteur se sait frère de Daniel (12,11). Ses doctrines les plus explicites sont conformes à la tradition rabbinique, mais Stone ne va pas jusqu'à faire de son auteur un docteur tannaïte. Rien à voir avec Qumrân en tout cas. Sur la parenté étroite entre *II Baruch* et *IV Esdras*, il n'y a pas de doute, mais le sens de la relation est incertain, de même que les rapports avec les *Antiquités Bibliques* du Pseudo-Philon. Comme sur le milieu d'origine (social matrix), l'introduction s'en tient à des *non liquet*, sans évaluer l'argumentation dans le détail. Il est fait mention de 4QPseudo-Ézéchiél. La dernière section de l'introduction s'attache à la permanence de l'œuvre dans la tradition chrétienne; elle est comme tout le reste informée et précise.

Le commentaire (450 grandes pages en petits caractères) ne peut se décrire. Qu'il suffise de dire que, allégé de remarques et de références inutiles, il s'attache aux vraies questions de structure et de sens. Aucun commentaire ne peut rivaliser avec celui-ci, et il en sera ainsi pour un temps. Cela ne signifie pas que je sois d'accord sur tous les points.

On ne peut s'arrêter à tous les détails. En 8,52, dans l'énumération jadis étudiée par Jacques Dupont en 1947 (que Stone connaît), la traduction ne suit pas sa reconstitution, mais elle en vient même à décomposer la formule «racine de sagesse», pourtant bien établie par ailleurs, en particulier dans l'énumération similaire de II Ba 59,7 (voir aussi 51,3), caractéristique de la littérature juive de la même époque (Si 1,6.20; Sg 3,15 et 15,3). Supposer que la racine soit implicitement celle du mal dans ce passage (on pourrait argumenter à partir de 3,2 *malignitate radices*, si la *malignitas* était voisine ici) me paraît inutile et trop compliqué.

Mais j'approuve lorsque, en 13,40, je lis «neuf et demie» (tribus) et lorsque je constate que l'apparat est correct. Mais on pourrait ajouter ceci: le latin ne peut avoir que *nouem* comme leçon de l'archétype, non *decem*; Bensly a un apparat correct, mais fait curieusement le mauvais choix; ensuite Violet et Klijn ont déformé l'apparat, ce qui achevait de rendre certaine la leçon *decem*. Les autres versions permettent de voir que la bonne leçon ne peut être que «neuf et demie».

Une question importante est cependant éludée par Stone, comme par tous les autres commentateurs. Ni les néotestamentaires ni les «intertestamentaires» ne se sont interrogés sur les rapports possibles entre les apocalypses juives de Baruch et d'Esdras et celle, chrétienne, de Jean. Ces trois écrits sont cependant contemporains, et voisins tant par leur genre littéraire que par les images qu'ils sont seuls ou presque à avoir en commun. On peut approcher ce problème de différentes manières.

1. *A propos du lieu et de la langue d'origine.* L'équivalence symbolique Rome-Babylone a pu exister avant 70, mais elle s'est imposée avec la destruction de Jérusalem et du Temple en 70. Or cette équivalence est attestée en milieu chrétien, dans l'Apocalypse de Jean, entre autres, et en milieu juif. Esdras, apocalypticien, pourrait-il vraiment dire qu'il est à Babylone s'il est en Israël? Il faut qu'il soit ou à Rome ou, du moins, dans l'Empire. Une origine en Israël paraît peu probable. Et ne doit-on pas raisonner de même

pour la langue? Supposons un instant que l'Apocalypse johannique ne soit plus transmise en grec, mais seulement en latin; les nombreux sémitismes qu'elle contient donneraient à croire qu'elle a été rédigée en hébreu ou en araméen. Rares sont cependant ceux qui, au vu du grec, ont avancé cette hypothèse. Il s'agit bien d'un grec de bilingue. Pour des œuvres telles que *II Baruch* et *IV Esdras*, ne peut-on tenir comme également possible cette hypothèse-là? Vraiment je le crois. Si mon combat paraît sans espoir, du moins doit-on admettre — et c'est particulièrement vrai pour *IV Esdras* — qu'il est écrit vers 100 de notre ère ou peu avant *IV Esdras* était déjà rendu en grec et connu des chrétiens avant la fin du II^e siècle (Clément d'Alexandrie). Le public visé devait être bien plus celui de la Diaspora qu'Israël. Même si l'on suppose un original hébreu (et Qumrân nous prouve que c'est possible), l'œuvre devait être reçue essentiellement sous sa forme grecque. Tout le problème de la « démonstrabilité » en matière de rétroversion est posé là.

2. *Esdras connaît-il l'Apocalypse de Jean?* Ne faut-il pas chercher — c'est faire un pas de plus — à mettre en dialogue les trois apocalypses contemporaines? Nous nous y sommes risqués dans deux articles (BETL 53 [1980] 47-68, qui suggère la succession *II Baruch*, Apocalypse de Jean, *IV Esdras*, et accessoirement: « Jérusalem dans les apocalypses contemporaines de Baruch, d'Esdras et de Jean », *Jérusalem dans les traditions juives et chrétiennes* [Publications de l'Institutum Iudaicum, Bruxelles; Leuven 1986] 15-23). Le commentaire de Stone n'omet pas de se référer à l'Apocalypse johannique, mais il le fait ponctuellement, sans vue d'ensemble.

Pour s'en tenir à *IV Esdras*, certaines des images et, en particulier, l'identification du fils défunt au Temple détruit dans la quatrième vision s'expliquent bien si *IV Esdras* répond non seulement au messianisme chrétien, mais aussi à l'Apocalypse johannique précisément. Esdras rencontre en vision la femme éplorée vivant dans le souvenir de son fils défunt — entendez: la communauté chrétienne autour de Jésus (évidemment Esdras ne partage pas la foi en la résurrection). Cette femme a quitté sa cité et son époux — comprenez: les chrétiens ont quitté Jérusalem et son Dieu. Esdras lui reproche donc de pleurer sur un homme au lieu d'endosser le malheur commun de Jérusalem; il l'invite à revenir. Puis Esdras lui-même pleure sur le Temple, tandis que la femme disparaît et qu'apparaît une cité glorieuse. C'est déjà presque clair. L'interprétation de l'ange va plus loin, en montrant à Esdras que les symboles qu'il interprétait en fonction des chrétiens, pouvaient s'entendre dans son sens: le fils pleuré, c'est justement le Temple; la femme éplorée, c'est Sion. Déjà J. Wellhausen avait indiqué cette lecture, et elle se comprend mieux si *IV Esdras* répond à l'Apocalypse de Jean. Ce n'est donc pas un hasard si le messianisme joue un rôle important (plus judiciaire que guerrier) dans les dernières visions de *IV Esdras* (voir p. 41).

Par son ampleur, par sa clarté d'exposition, par la prudence de ses choix, en dépit de nos remarques (et, qui sait? plus encore après elles), ce commentaire est destiné à faire autorité.

Abbaye de Maredsous
5537 - Denée
Belgique

Pierre-Maurice BOGAERT

NUNTII PERSONARUM ET RERUM

III^e Colloque International de l'Association pour la Recherche sur la Syrie-Palestine à l'Époque Perse

Thème: La Transeuphratène à l'époque perse: contacts et échanges culturels

Date et lieu: 21-23 avril 1994 à l'Institut Catholique de Paris, 21 rue d'Assas, Paris 6^e

Le colloque compte tirer profit des progrès récents en sociologie historique et attirer l'attention sur les lieux privilégiés des contacts et des échanges, sur leurs rythmes et fréquences, sur les statuts sociaux et les fonctions des partenaires impliqués, sur les résultats enfin, depuis les simples emprunts jusqu'aux changements culturels profonds et aux réactions identitaires.

Pour tous renseignements, écrire à:

Josette Elayi ou Jean Sapin

ASPEP, Bibliothèque Biblique BOSBEB

21 rue d'Assas

F-75270 Paris Cedex 06

Persian Period Discussion Group

An electronic discussion group devoted to interdisciplinary approaches to biblical texts and related literature of the Persian Period (6th-4th centuries BCE) has been formed. Subscriptions are available by sending the messages SUB PERSIA-L YOURFULLNAME to LISTSERV@EMUVM1 or to LISTSERV@EMUVM1.CC.EMORY.EDU. The formation of the list was commissioned by the steering committee of the Literature and History of the Persian Period Group of the Society of Biblical Literature and grew out of earlier discussions by members of the Sociology of the Second Temple Group and the Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah Section of the SBL. Requests for additional information about the list may be addressed to M. Patrick Graham, list coordinator (LIBMPG@EUMBM1 or LIBMPG@EMYVM1.CC.EMORY.EDU).

Pontificium Institutum Biblicum
Annus academicus 1992-1993. I semestre

Auditores inscripti erant 327, qui in diversas categorias sic distribuebantur:

	Ad Doctoratum	Ad Licentiam	Hospites	Universi
Fac. Biblica	16	277	22	315
Fac. Orientalistica	—	—	12	12
Universi	16	277	34	327
Nationes	63		Alumni	327
Dioceses	164		Alumni	172
Inst. Religiosorum	39		Alumni	116
Inst. Religiosarum	9		Alumnae	9
Ex statu laicali	30		Alumnae	16
			Alumni	14

Laureae

Laureae in Re Biblica digni declarati sunt:

BISSOLI, Giovanni, OFM (22.01.93). *La corrispondenza fra tempio celeste e terrestre nella letteratura giudaica antica e neotestamentaria* (Magna cum laude). Moderator: R. LE DÉAUT.

ESCAFFRE, Bernadette (4.12.92). *Traditions concernant Élie et rôle du prophète dans le récit de la crucifixion de Marc* (Magna cum laude). Moderator: J. SWETNAM.

ŁUKASZ, Czesław, SJ (11.12.92). *Evangelizzazione e conflitto. Indagine sulla coerenza letteraria e tematica della pericope di Cornelio (At 10,1-11,18)* (Magna cum laude). Moderator: J. KILGALLEN.

NAGEL, Elizabeth M. (8.01.93). *Genesis 15: The Doubling of a Form* (Cum laude). Moderator: J. L. SKA.

POPOVIC, Anto, OFM (23.10.92). *The Election-Rejection of Saul (1 Sam 9,1-11,15; 13,7b-15a; 15; 28,3-25)* (Cum laude). Moderator: S. PISANO.

Doctor in Re Biblica renuntiatus est, typis edita thesi:

MINDLING, Joseph Allen, OFM Cap., *Conceptions of a Felicitous After-life in the Hebrew Old Testament*. Washington, DC – Rome 1989 (extractum).

LIBRI AD DIRECTIONEM MISSI

La liste ci-dessous comprend tous les livres adressés à *Biblica* qui sont en rapport avec les études bibliques, y compris ceux qui ne pourront faire l'objet d'un compte rendu. En signalant un ouvrage, la Revue ne se prononce pas à son sujet.

Les livres envoyés à la Revue ne seront pas retournés à l'expéditeur, même si aucun compte rendu n'en est publié (à moins qu'ils n'aient été envoyés sur demande de la Direction).

Les livres et les articles ou extraits de revues qui nous sont adressés seront communiqués au directeur de l'*Elenchus of Biblical Bibliography*.

Prière d'adresser les envois à la «Direction de *Biblica*, Pontificio Istituto Biblico, Via della Pilotta 25, 00187 Rome, Italie».

Amit, Yairah, *The Book of Judges the Art of Editing* (The Biblical Encyclopaedia Library 6). Tel Aviv, Tel Aviv University, 1992. XII-396 p. 13,5 × 21

Association Internationale Bible et Informatique: Actes du Troisième Colloque International. Bible et Informatique: Interprétation, Herméneutique, Compétence Informatique (Travaux de Linguistique Quantitative 49). Paris-Genève, Champion-Slatkine, 1992. 661 p. 14,5 × 22

Attridge, Harold W., *The Epistle to the Hebrews*. A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews (Hermeneia). Philadelphia, Fortress Press, 1989. XXVIII-437 p. 21,5 × 24

Auffret, Pierre, *Quatre Psaumes et un Cinquième*. Étude structurelle des psaumes 7 à 10 et 35. Paris, Letouzey & Ané, 1992. 273 p. 15,5 × 23. FF 340

Bal, Mieke (ed.). *Anti-Covenant*. Counter-Reading Women's Lives in the Hebrew Bible (Journal for the Study of the O.T. Supplement Series 81). Sheffield, Almond Press, 1989. 243 p. 14,1 × 22. £25.00 - \$42.50

Beauchamp, Paul, S.J., *All'Inizio, Dio Parla*. Itinerari biblici (Bibbia e Preghiera 14). Roma, Edizioni Associazione della Preghiera, 1992. 260 p. 14 × 21. Lit. 20.000

Blenkinsopp, Joseph, *The Pentateuch*. An Introduction to the First Five Books of the Bible (The Anchor Bible Reference Library). New York, Doubleday, 1992. XI-273 p. 16 × 24. \$25.00

Bosetti, Elena, *La Tenda e il Bastone*. Figure e simboli della pastorale biblica (Narrare la Bibbia 1). Torino, Edizioni Paoline, 1992. 159 p. 17 × 24. Lit. 22.000

Bowell, David B., *Matthew's Inclusive Story* (JSNT Supplement Series 42). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1990. 292 p. 14 × 22. £25.00 - \$43.50

Brettler, Marc Zvi, *God is King*. Understanding an Israelite Metaphor (JSOT Supplement Series 76). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1989. 233 p. 14 × 22. £25.00 - \$43.50

Briend, Jacques, *Dieu dans l'Écriture* (LD 150). Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 1992. 136 p. 13,5 × 21,5. FF 150

Brooke, George J. (ed.), *Temple Scroll Studies*. Papers presented at the International Symposium on the Temple Scroll Manchester, Dec. 1987. (Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series 7). Sheffield, JSOT Press, 1989. 299 p. 14,1 × 22. £26.50 - \$45.00

Bulletin de Saint-Sulpice. Revue annuelle sur la formation des prêtres 18. L'enseignement de l'Écriture saint / Teaching the Scriptures. Paris, Compagnie des Prêtres de Saint-Sulpice, 1992. 380 p. 13,5 × 21,5. FF 100

Burtchaell, James Tunstead, *From Synagogue to Church*. Public services and offices in the earliest Christian communities. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1992. xviii-375 p. 16 × 23,5. £40.00

Casalini, Nello, O.F.M., *Agli Ebrei*. Discorso di esortazione (Studium Biblicum Franciscanum Analecta 34). Jerusalem, Franciscan Printing Press, 1992. 459 p. 16,5 × 23,5. \$35.00

Cavalletti, Sofia, *Il giudaismo intertestamentario* (Leggere oggi la Bibbia 3.14). Brescia, Editrice Queriniana, 1991. 110 p. 13 × 21. Lit. 15.000

Culley, Robert C., *Themes and Variations*. A Study of Action in Biblical Narrative (Society of Biblical Literature Semeia Studies). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1992. viii-190 p. 14 × 21,5. Cloth: \$44.95 (\$29.95); paper: \$29.95 (\$19.95)

Doorly, William J., *Isaiah of Jerusalem*. An Introduction. New York-Mahwah, Paulist Press, 1992. xxiv-163 p. 15 × 23. \$9.95

Exum, J. Cheryl (ed.), *Signs and Wonders*. Biblical Texts in Literary Focus (Semeia Studies). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1989. vii-247 p. 14 × 21,4. Cloth: \$32.95 (\$21.95); paper: \$21.95 (\$14.95)

Freedman, David Noel (editor-in-chief), *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. 6 vols. New York, Doubleday, 1992. 19,5 × 24. \$360.00

Galambush, Julie, *Jerusalem in the Book of Ezekiel*. The City as Yahweh's Wife (SBL Dissertation Series 130). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1992. xiii-181 p. 14 × 21,5. Cloth: \$29.95 (\$19.95); paper: \$19.95 (\$14.95)

Gnilka, Joachim, *Teologia del Nuovo Testamento* (Biblioteca biblica 9). Brescia, Editrice Queriniana, 1992. 180 p. 16 × 23. Lit. 25.000

Henne, Philippe, O.P., *L'unité du Pasteur d'Hermas*. Tradition et rédaction (Cahiers de la Revue Biblique 31). Paris, Gabalda, 1992. 196 p. 16 × 24. FF 190

Hoglund, Kenneth G., *Achaemenid Imperial Administration in Syria-Palestine and the Missions of Ezra and Nehemiah* (SBLDS 125). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1992. xii-275 p. 14 × 21,5. Cloth: \$44.95 (\$29.95); paper: \$29.95 (\$19.95)

Holladay, Carl R., *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors*. Vol. II: Poets (Texts and Translations 30; Pseudepigrapha Series 12). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1989. x-529 p. 15,1 × 22,9. Cloth: \$25.95 (\$16.95); paper: \$16.94 (\$11.95)

The Holy Bible, The Book of Deuteronomy (Japanese). Tokyo, Studium Biblicum Franciscanum, 1989. 15,3 × 21,5

Horn, Friedrich Wilhelm, *Das Angeld des Geistes*. Studien zur paulinischen Pneumatologie (FRLANT 154). Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992. 478 p. 16,5 × 24. DM 158,—

Humphrey, Hugh H., "*He is Risen!*". A New Reading of Mark's Gospel. New York–Mahwah, N. J., Paulist Press, 1992. v-184 p. 15 × 23

Jacob, Benno, *The Second Book of the Bible: Exodus*. Interpreted by Benno Jacob. Hoboken, KTAV Publishing House, Inc., 1992. xxxv-1099 p. 16 × 24,5. \$69.50

Jemielly, Thomas, *Satire and the Hebrew Prophets* (Literary Currents in Biblical Interpretation). Louisville, Westminster/John Knox Press, 1992. 256 p. 14 × 21,5. \$17.95

Kaiser, Otto, *Grundriss der Einleitung in die kanonischen und deuterokanonischen Schriften des Alten Testaments*. Band 1: Die erzählenden Werke. Gütersloh, Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1992. 180 p. 15,5 × 23. DM 48,—

Kessler, Rainer, *Staat und Gesellschaft im vorexilischen Juda*. Vom 8. Jahrhundert bis zum Exil (VTS 47). Leiden, E. J. Brill, 1992. xi-246 p. 16 × 24,5. Dfl 140,— \$80.00

King, Karen L. (ed.), *Images of the Feminine in Gnosticism* (Studies in Antiquity & Christianity). Philadelphia, Fortress Press, 1988. xxi-455 p. 15,7 × 23,3

Lambrecht, Jan, S. J., *Out of the Treasure*. The Parables in the Gospel of Matthew (Louvain Theological and Pastoral Monographs 10). Louvain, Peeters Press – W. B. Eerdmans, 1992. 299 p. BF 695

Levin, Israel (ed.), *Studies in the Works of Abraham Ibn-Ezra* (Te'uda, The Chaim Rosenberg School of Jewish Studies 8). Tel Aviv, Tel Aviv University, 1992. xviii-214 p. 16 × 23

Lewis, Theodore J., *Cults of the Dead In Ancient Israel and Ugarit* (Harvard Semitic Monographs 39). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1989. xviii-230 p. 13,7 × 22. \$20.95 (\$13.95)

Lindars, Barnabas, *Essays on John* (Studiorum Novi Testamenti Auxilia 17). Leuven, University Press – Uitgeverij Peeters, 1992. xvii-233 p. 16 × 24. BF 1000

Loewenstamm, Samuel E., *The Evolution of the Exodus Tradition* (Publication of the Perry Foundation for Biblical Research in the Hebrew University of Jerusalem). Jerusalem, The Magnes Press, 1992. 310 p. 16 × 23. \$27.00

Löfstedt, Bengt, *Sedulius Scottus Kommentar zum Evangelium nach Matthäus*. 1,1–11,1 (Vetus Latina – Aus der Geschichte der lateinischen Bibel 14). Freiburg im Breisgau, Herder, 1989. 306 p. 16 × 24

Lust, J. – **Eynikel**, E. – **Hauspie**, K. (compiled by), *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*. Part I: A-I. Stuttgart, Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1992. liii-217 p. 16 × 23,5. DM 38,—

Matera, Frank J., *Galatians* (Sacra Pagina Series 9). Collegeville, The Liturgical Press, 1992. xiii-252 p. 16 × 23,5

Michaud, Jean-Paul, *María de los evangelios* (Cuadernos bíblicos 77). Estella, Editorial Verbo Divino, 1992. 74 p. 20,5 × 19

Migliore, Franzo, *Introduzione al Nuovo Testamento* (Armarius 3). Soveria Mannelli, Rubbettino Editore, 1992. 309 p. 13 × 21. Lit. 30.000

Moran, William L. (ed. and tr.), *The Amarna Letters*. Baltimore and London, The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992. XLVII-393 p. 16 × 24. \$78.00

Nelson, Milward Douglas, *The Syriac Version of the Wisdom of Ben Sira Compared to the Greek and Hebrew Materials* (SBL Dissertation Series 107). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1989. VIII-142 p. 14 × 21,4. Cloth: \$17.95 (\$11.95); paper: \$11.95 (\$7.95)

New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity: Volume 6. A Review of the Greek Inscriptions and Papyri published in 1980-81. Macquarie University, Ancient History Documentary Research Centre, 1992. VII-227 p. 18 × 24. \$45.00 (\$55.00)

Ognibeni, Bruno, *Tradizioni orali di lettura e testo ebraico della Bibbia*. Studio di diciassette ketiv *lō' qere lō* (Studia Friburgensia – Nouvelle Série 72). Fribourg Suisse, Éditions Universitaires, 1989. XVII-276 p. 15,5 × 22,5. SFr 38,—

O'Grady, John F., *Pillars of Paul's Gospel*. Galatians and Romans. New York–Mahwah, Paulist Press, 1992. v-178. 15 × 23. \$9.95

Omodeo, Adolfo, *Gesù il Nazoreo*. Nuova edizione e saggio introduttivo di Francesco Erasmo Sciuto (Armarius 2). Soveria Mannelli, Rubbettino Editore, 1992. 188 p. 13 × 21. Lit. 20.000

Overman, J. Andrew, *Matthew's Gospel and Formative Judaism*. The Social World of the Matthean Community. Minneapolis, Fortress Press, 1990. IX-174 p. 13,7 × 21,5

Le Pentateuque. Débats et Recherches (LD 151). XIV^e Congrès de l'ACFEB, Angers (1991). Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 1992. 270 p. 13,5 × 21,5. FF 155

Poppi, Angelico, *Sinossi dei Quattro Vangeli Greco-Italiano*. Testo Greco dal Codice Vaticano (B, 03). Vol. 1 Testo. Padova, Edizioni Messaggero, 1992. 638 p. 16,5 × 24. Lit. 55.000

Räsänen, Heikki, *Jesus, Paul and Torah*. Collected Essays (JSNT Supplement Series 43). Sheffield, JSOT Press, 1992. 286 p. 14 × 22. £30.00 (£22.50) – \$50.00 (\$37.59)

Ralph, Margaret Nutting, *Discovering Old Testament Origins*. The Books of Genesis, Exodus and Samuel. New York–Mahwah, Paulist Press, 1992. VI-319 p. 15 × 23. \$12.95

Reyburn, William D., *A Handbook on Lamentations* (UBS Handbook Series). New York, United Bible Societies, 1992. IX-166 p. 16 × 23,5. \$8.95

Ruffing, Andreas, *Jahwekrieg als Weltmetapher*. Studien zu Jahwekriegstexten des chronistischen Sondergutes (SBB 24). Stuttgart, Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1992. 402 p. 15,5 × 23. DM 49,—

Ruppert, Lothar, *Genesis*. Ein kritischer und theologischer Kommentar: 1. Teilband: Gen 1,1–11,26 (Forschung zur Bibel 70). Würzburg, Echter Verlag, 1992. X-536 p. 15,5 × 23,5. DM 64,—

Sacchi, Paolo (ed.), *Apocrifi dell'Antico Testamento* (Classici delle religioni, La religione ebraica). Torino, Unione Tipografico-Editrice Torinese, 1989. 658 p. 15,5 × 23,5. Lit. 85.000

Sant, Carmel, *Bible Translation and Language*. Essays into the History of Bible Translation in Maltese (Melita Theologica Supplementary Series 2). Faculty of Theology, University of Malta, 1992. xii-343 p. 14 × 21

Scott, James M., *Adoption as Sons of God*. An Exegetical Investigation into the Background of ὙΙΟΣ in the Pauline Corpus (WUNT 48). Tübingen, J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1992. xv-353 p. 15,5 × 23. DM 79,—

Simon, Uriel, *Abraham Ibn Ezra's Two Commentaries on the Minor Prophets*. An Annotated Critical Edition – Volume One: Hosea, Joel, Amos (Hebrew). Ramat Gan, Bar-Ilan University Press, 1989. 332 p. 17,5 × 24,5

Smith, Robert H., *Matthew* (Augsburg Commentary on the New Testament). Minneapolis, Augsburg Publishing House, 1989. 351 p. 13 × 19,5

Supplément au Dictionnaire de la Bible, sous la direction de Jacques **Briend** et Édouard **Cothenet**. Fascicule 66: Satan (et démons)-Scribes. Paris, Letouzey & Ané, Éditeurs, 1992. Col. 1-256. 19,5 × 28. FF 300

Tournay, Raymond Jacques, *Word of God, Song of Love*. A Commentary on the Song of Songs. Mahwah, Paulist Press, 1988. 194 p. 13 × 20,3. \$11.95

Trobisch, David, *Die Entstehung der Paulusbriefsammlung*. Studien zu den Anfängen christlicher Publizistik (Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus 10). Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht – Freiburg Schweiz, Universitätsverlag, 1989. 163 p. 15,5 × 23,5. SFr 42,—

van der Meer, Willem, *Oude Woorden worden Nieuw*. De Opbouw van het Boek Joël. Kampen, J. H. Kok, 1989. x-346. 16 × 24. Dfl 49,50

Van Seters, John, *Prologue to History*. The Yahwist as Historian in Genesis. Louisville, Westminster/John Knox Press, 1992. xvi-367 p. 16 × 23,5. \$27.99

Wall, Robert W. – **Lemcio**, Eugene E., *The New Testament as Canon*. A Reader in Canonical Criticism (JSNT Supplement Series 76). Sheffield, JSOT Press, 1992. 376 p. 14 × 22. £45.00 (£33.75) - \$70.00 (\$52.50)

Watts, James W., *Psalms and Story*. Inset Hymns in Hebrew Narrative (JSOT Supplement Series 139). Sheffield, JSOT Press, 1992. 246 p. 14 × 22. £27.50 (£19.95) - \$47.50 (\$35.00)

Wente, Edward (ed.), *Letters from Ancient Egypt* (SBL Writings from the Ancient World Series – Vol. 1). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1990. xii-271 p. 15 × 23. Cloth: \$25.95 (\$16.95); paper: \$16.95 (\$11.95)

ISSN 0006-0887

PIETRO BOCCACCIO, Direttore Responsabile

Autorizz. Tribunale di Roma n. 6229 del 24-3-1958 del Reg. della Stampa

Finito di stampare il 12 marzo 1993
 Tipografia Poliglotta della Pontificia Università Gregoriana
 Piazza della Pilotta, 4 – 00187 Roma